

BISHOP AND TEST.

On the sixth and seventh pages of this issue of THE STANDARD, will be found a document which many of our readers have heard of but few have ever read—the letter on the land question addressed, in 1881, by Dr. Thomas Nulty, bishop of Meath, Ireland, to the clergy and laity of his diocese.

This letter, it may be observed, was written by Dr. Nulty before he had read "Progress and Poverty," or perhaps ever heard of it. It is the result of the independent observation and study of a Catholic divine, whose orthodoxy and theological learning no one can question, whose life has been spent in a purely agricultural part of Ireland, and who, as this letter shows, is disposed to view the land question from that standpoint. Yet its conclusions are precisely the same as those with which my name is so often associated, and it will be evident to any one who reads this letter that what is sometimes spoken of as "Georgeism," could with quite as much propriety be styled "Nultyism."

But what gives this letter a peculiar importance here and at this time, is its relation to the case of Dr. McGlynn. The opinions which Archbishop Corrigan, supported by the Roman propaganda, declares to be inconsistent with the teachings of the church and to have been condemned by the pope, are the same opinions which have been openly taught by the greatest and most influential of the Irish Catholic prelates. The American priest has in nothing gone beyond the Irish bishop. He has pointed out the same injustice; he has proclaimed the same fundamental truth; he has proposed the same remedy. What, then, becomes of Catholic uniformity if in New York Dr. McGlynn shall be excommunicated, while in Ireland Dr. Nulty remains bishop of Meath?

Perhaps, however, when he reads this letter in THE STANDARD, Archbishop Corrigan may communicate with Rome and have Dr. Nulty excommunicated also! The Italian propaganda cannot like the sturdy Irishman. For it was he who, when they were bent upon placing another tool of England in the archbishopric vacated by the death of Cardinal McCabe, told them mainly that they had no divine guarantee that Ireland would remain faithful to the Roman see if they persisted in using their ecclesiastical power to crush the just aspirations of the people.

Thenceforth, which Dr. Nulty addressed presents to the laity of his diocese with the minister in which "his grace" of New York saw fit to address his "subjects" on the same questions. The one, as is evident by his letter, has made a long study of political economy; the other, as is evident by his pastoral, is in utter ignorance of its first principles. Yet Dr. Nulty, when moved to present his long and well considered views on the land question to the clergy and laity of his diocese, does so in the form of a personal essay, which he dedicates to them as his friends and brethren, expressly disclaiming in this the official character of a bishop, and telling them: "I have no divine commission to enlighten you on your civil rights or to instruct you in the principles of land tenure or political economy."

Archbishop Corrigan, on the contrary, assumes it to be the duty and privilege of his office to thrust his crude views upon the consciences of the Catholics of New York, and embodies them in an official pastoral which the priests of his diocese are compelled to read to their flocks from their altars.

The dedication of Bishop Nulty's address is, in fact, the strongest testimony that could be given to the canonical correctness of the position of Dr. McGlynn—that as a Catholic priest he has a perfect right to hold what opinions he pleases upon questions of civil rights or political economy—all the stronger because this testimony that the ecclesiastical authority does not extend to matters of civil rights and political economy is given, as a matter of course, by a Catholic bishop years before the American controversy had arisen.

Of special interest to Catholics as presenting the views of an eminent Catholic theologian and bishop, this letter of Dr. Nulty is well worthy the attention of men of all beliefs. For though containing here and there a sentence or a paragraph which may not be readily understood by those unfamiliar with the writings of the economists whose works it is evident Dr. Nulty has carefully studied, and bearing evidence of the influence of environment in the disposition to dwell on the question with peculiar reference to agriculture, while almost ignoring the even more striking manifestations of the same principles in great cities and industrial centers, this essay is yet as a whole a most admirable presentation in all its breadth and fullness of the land question, or rather, as Dr. Nulty clearly recognizes it to be, the great social question of our times. And to anyone who understands the great, almost crushing weight which the authority of the English economists has had upon the thought of cultured men on the other side of the Atlantic, the manner in which the Irish

bishop, while accepting their views in many respects, discards their leadership in others, and goes straight to the heart of the most important questions will inspire the greatest respect for his intellectual freedom and strength, not unmingled with regret that his daily round of episcopal ministrations over a large diocese should leave him so little opportunity for work of this kind. If Archbishop Corrigan would only get Dr. Nulty excommunicated as well as Dr. McGlynn, Ireland might lose a bishop, but the cause of the emancipation of labor, the whole world over, would gain an apostle.

In beginning his essay Bishop Nulty recognizes the wide and long acceptance of private property in land. Yet this he declares cannot justify an institution in itself unjust, and he points to the wide and long acceptance, even by the Christian church itself, of property in human flesh and blood as evidence that no amount of sanction that the world can give to a social institution ought to prevent inquiry into its essential character. Having thus at the outset disposed of the main argument of the defenders of the right of private property in land, he goes on to show how and why the right of private ownership does attach to things that are produced by human labor, and how the recognition of this right is necessary to social well being. But from the necessity of private property in the products of labor, he deduces with irresistible logic the common right to land, and in words which could not be made stronger, he, over and over again, asserts the absolutely equal right of every human being to the land of his country as his equal share in the gift of a common Creator.

Starting again, from the irrefutable proposition that the inhabitants of every country are equally entitled to the use and enjoyment of the land of that country, Dr. Nulty proceeds to inquire how best this common estate may be utilized to the greatest advantage of all. Showing that each individual is entitled to the full enjoyment of the fruits of his own exertions, and that security in the possession of land is necessary to the individual use of land, he arrives at the conclusion that the value which the growth of society gives to the original and indestructible qualities of the soil should be taken for the use of the community, leaving to the improver or user that value which is due to his improvements or use. That rent, in the economic sense of the word (that is to say, the value attaching to land by reason of social growth and improvement, as distinguished from the value which may be produced upon it by the exertions of the individual user), is the natural provision for social needs. And this evidence of creative intent fills him, as it must every man who recognizes it, with a new and deep sense of the beauty of the creative scheme. For it shows that the wrongs and injustice which under present conditions seem due to the very advance of civilization, do not result from any failure or jangle of natural laws, but are due solely to the injustice of human laws, which, denying to the masses of men their most obvious natural rights, make what was intended by God for the use of all the private property of a few, and turn the patrimony of the whole people, the great fund arising from social growth and improvement, into a fund for the encouragement of monopolization and waste and the promotion of monstrous social inequality. Dr. Nulty sees clearly the real reason why the marvelous increase of productive power by modern invention has failed to raise wages, and why the enormous increase in wealth has served but to make want more bitter. He sees that the prime cause of our social difficulties, the real root of the seeming conflict between labor and capital, which is the most menacing danger of our time, arises simply from the monopolization which has been permitted in that natural element indispensably necessary to production and to life, and he sounds the keynote of the great struggle for the emancipation of labor and the abolition of poverty in the rallying cry with which he concludes, "Back to the land!"

A notable thing about Dr. Nulty's letter is its catholicity. It is not animated by that narrow spirit characteristic of the Irish parliamentary leaders, and which was recently emphasized in Mr. William O'Brien's refusal to attend the demonstration of New York workmen. Dr. Nulty does not treat of the Irish land question as though it were something peculiar to Ireland, and having no relation to the land question anywhere else; but while he uses Irish illustrations, the Irish land question is in his view only the local phase of a world-wide question. Though he is directly addressing the agricultural tenants of Meath, he does not fail to point out that the land question is of as much importance to artisans and laborers and business men as it is to farmers. And he closes with an appeal to the masses of Great Britain, not to have pity on Ireland; not to do anything specially for Ireland; not to take part in the settlement of an Irish question, but with the rallying cry of "Back to the land!" to join, for their own sakes and for the sake of their own country, in a common struggle for the emancipation of labor everywhere by the assertion of the natural rights, not of Irishmen, but of man!

If Dr. Nulty's spirit had animated the Irish leaders, the landlords of the British

parliament, instead of being engaged to-day in pushing through a new coercion bill for Ireland, would have had every energy engrossed in fighting for the retention of their own privileges. If the same effort and the same expenditure that have been devoted to the making of a purely Irish fight in the British parliament had been devoted to arousing the masses of the three kingdoms to a common struggle for common rights, England, Scotland and Wales would be to-day settling with revolt against that system of common robbery to which the oppressions of Ireland are due. For it is as true of nations and of parties as it is of men that he who would evoke sympathy must evince sympathy. To tell the British masses that the Irish struggle is merely for the Irish people; to substitute for the great principle of equal rights for all men in all countries a paltry twopenny demand that the Irish landlord should be compelled to scale down the rent of the Irish agricultural tenant; to talk constantly of Irish evictions as though evictions were unknown anywhere else, and of Irish oppressions as though the masses were nowhere else oppressed, is not merely to forego the opportunity to awake an answering chord in the hearts of millions, but to leave the opponents of the Irish cause free to avail themselves of prejudices of nationality and creed that would be consumed as stubble in the flame of a common struggle for the common rights of all men. If Davitt had been permitted to carry the torch of social revolution from Land's End to John o' Groat's, as his good angel has constantly whispered to him to do; if the Irish eloquence that has been wasted on empty benches at St. Stephen's in picturing Irish woes and demanding Irish concessions had rung out the clear note of God-given rights, the Irish leaders would ere this have "carried the war into Africa," and a British revolution would have already begun to shake to their fall the very foundations of monarchy and aristocracy.

But instead of this, the effort of the men who since 1882 have had control of the Irish movement has been of a piece with the conduct of Mr. O'Brien in New York. They have striven in every way to avoid the identification of the Irish cause with the cause of universal freedom; they have pulled down and hidden away the grand banner of "the land for the people" and have raised in its stead, not the harp of universal harmony and the sunburst of universal liberty, but a little green flag inscribed, "Home rule for Ireland," and "Twenty per cent reduction for Irish tenant farmers."

This magnificent declaration of fundamental principles by an influential Irish bishop ought to have been scattered broadcast through Ireland at least, if not through England and Scotland as well; but instead of that it is probably as little known in Ireland as in the United States. The money which the Irish parliamentary leaders have expended in printers' ink has been used to write down these principles, not to disseminate them.

There are, however, three sentences of this letter that did once get a magnificent circulation, being printed in every daily paper in the three kingdoms and telegraphed in hot haste to Cardinal Simeoni in Rome. They are the sentences beginning, "Now, therefore, the land of every country is the common property of the people of that country." In 1882, when I was in Ireland as correspondent of the Irish World, a copy of that paper (which was then as carefully excluded from Ireland as though it had been dynamite, although it was at that time advocating nothing but the moral dynamite of the idea that God made the land for the people) reached me in Dublin. It contained on the first page those sentences, with a fac simile of the signature of Dr. Nulty. It struck me that they would make a good thing to substitute for the "no rent" proclamations which the constabulary all over Ireland had been engaged in tearing down. As the leading men of the Irish movement were then in jail or in England, the Ladies' Land League had the management of affairs, and Miss Parnell readily consented to send this ringing declaration out in proclamation form with a request that it be posted up. A few days thereafter the press of the three kingdoms contained, with appropriate comments, the shocking "incendiary" proclamation of an Irish bishop, which was being posted over Ireland. "His eminence," Cardinal Simeoni, must have been deeply horrified. What Latin correspondence ensued I know not; but Dr. Nulty had to come out with a card stating that he had nothing to do with the matter, which was indeed absolutely true.

Among my letters this week comes to me one from Ireland, written by one of the most learned and lovable regular priests that it has ever been my good fortune to know, expressing the strongest approbation of the stand taken by Dr. McGlynn, and inclosing his application for membership in the Anti-poverty society. He has been enrolled.

Another letter, postmarked this city, contains this. The name of the pastor to whom it is addressed and who sends it to me it is, of course, unnecessary to give:

CHANCERY OFFICE,
366 Mulberry Street,
New York, June 7, 1887.
Reverend Sir—I am authorized by the most reverend archbishop to collect the cathedraticum for the present year. Your church is rated on the cathedraticum book at \$200. Please remit to this office at your earliest convenience. Yours very respectfully,
THOMAS S. PRESTON,
Vicar-General.

The cathedraticum is the tax which every Catholic church in this diocese is obliged to pay toward the personal salary of the archbishop. It used to be only \$100 instead of \$200, and that when the archbishopal income from the deaths of Catholics was not so large as it is now. When Archbishop McCloskey was made a cardinal it was doubled on the plea that more money was needed to support the dignity of the cardinalate. There was some excuse for this, since the red cap, and the bearer of the red cap, and the noble guard who accompanies him, and all the other heavy expenses must be paid for by the recipient. But it was not reduced when Archbishop Corrigan succeeded Cardinal McCloskey without being made a cardinal. The subject priest who wishes this demand from "My Lord" Preston printed in THE STANDARD intends it as the only hint he dares to make that the cathedraticum ought to be reduced. Seeing that the archbishop gets a salary of \$5,000 from the cathedral, besides the palace and its expenses, and that he has, moreover, a tax of \$1 apiece on all the burials in Calvary cemetery, which must make his personal income something over \$40,000 per year, while the salaries of parish priests are only \$800, the feeling of this pastor is quite natural.

Illustrative of the manner in which Protestants who have been so deeply concerned about papal aggressions are now applauding the action of Rome in Dr. McGlynn's case, is an article in the current number of the Episcopal monthly, the Church Review, by the Rev. E. F. V. Huiginn. Mr. Huiginn declares that, being a Catholic, Dr. McGlynn must submit his economic and political opinions to the pope, because the doctrine of infallibility carries with it the right to say what things this infallibility attaches to. Of what use, he asks, is this infallibility if each individual has the power to say: "This doctrine of mine does not come within the limits of faith or morals?" "Of what use is it if the pope does not know if a certain proposition lies within the limits of his so-called infallibility?" If this Protestant view of the doctrine of infallibility were really what Catholics understood by it, then, indeed, it would be past comprehension how any intelligent man could believe in the infallibility of the pope. But in reality, in the Catholic view, the limits of papal infallibility are not only extremely narrow, but absolutely fixed. To make an infallible utterance the pope must speak *ex cathedra*—that is to say, in his highest official capacity as head of the whole church; he must speak on matters of faith and morals; and he must speak to the whole universal church. And it is no more within the power of the pope to infallibly declare that a matter relates to faith and morals which does not obviously and to common apprehension relate to faith and morals than it is to address a part of the church and declare it the whole church. Or, to put the matter in another form, the quality of infallibility is, in the Catholic view, not positive, but negative. It does not consist in an inspiration to speak truthfully, but in a providential restriction, which in certain conditions and upon certain subjects, prevents speaking falsely. Catholics believe, in short, that when speaking in any other capacity, on any other subjects, or to any other body, the pope could do or say what he pleased, and might make an utterance inspired by ignorance, or passion, or avarice; but when he comes to speak *ex cathedra* to the universal church, and on matters of faith and morals, if he tried to teach false doctrine, Divine Providence would interfere to prevent him.

For instance if Urban VIII, speaking *ex cathedra* and addressing the universal church, had declared, as a matter of faith and morals, that the earth did not move around the sun, but that the sun moved around the earth, no Catholic of the present day would deem that utterance infallible. Catholics would say that this utterance of Urban VIII was not infallible, because it did not fulfill one of the required conditions of infallibility—because, no matter what Urban VIII might have declared, the question whether the sun moved around the earth or the earth moved around the sun was not a matter of faith and morals, but a matter of physical science.

Here is an authoritative statement of Catholic belief on this subject, taken from a standard Catholic text book, "The Faith of Catholics," by Fathers Berington and Kirk, two eminent English priests, and which may be read with advantage, not only by those anti-Catholics who entertain the vulgar Protestant belief that a good Catholic can have no conscience or reason of his own, and is bound by his religion to believe anything the pope may tell him, but also by that class of Catholics who are just now doing their best to give color to this slander:

EXTENT OF THE INERRANCY OF THE CHURCH.
PROPOSITION XI.
It is not article of the Catholic faith that the church cannot err, either in matters of fact not relating to faith, or in matters of discipline, things allowable by the circumstances of time and place; or in matters of speculation or civil policy, depending on mere human judgment or testimony. These things are no revelations deposited in the church in regard

of which alone she has the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit.

I published last week, as furnished by a Catholic priest, the text of the oath denying and abjuring the proposition that the earth moves round the sun, which the cardinals of the holy inquisition—with the approval of the then pope—compelled Galileo, two centuries and a half ago, to make. And I also published the declaration of this priest that Galileo flinched from his clear duty, and was even worse than those ignorant cardinals and that ignorant pope, because, knowing that "the earth did move around the sun, he did not suffer himself to be burned alive at the stake rather than deny that truth."

In view of the coming excommunication of Dr. McGlynn for refusing to deny and abjure a truth as clear, and to men far more important, here is a question which Catholics ought to put to themselves:

If Galileo had been excommunicated for refusing to deny that the earth moves around the sun—as he surely would have been if the disciplinary power of the church had not then possessed more effective means of coercion than it has now—what binding force would this excommunication have had upon Galileo, and what binding force would it have had upon other Catholics?

Dr. McGlynn's friends, with the sanction of Dr. McGlynn himself, have very properly refused to have anything to do with the proposal to send a petition to Rome asking the pope to reinstate him as pastor of St. Stephen's. The time when American Catholics could with self-respect petition the pope in this matter has gone by, and they owe it to themselves and to their faith to settle, once for all, the question whether their political opinions and political actions are to be dictated from Rome or not. This is not to be settled by petition, but by protest. The demonstration which the workmen of New York propose to hold on Saturday evening will be such a protest; but the protest that would be most effective, both on Madison avenue and at Rome, would be the shrinkage of the cathedraticum and the falling off of Peter's pence. The Italian monsignori will shrug their shoulders at American Catholic indignation so long as American Catholic money continues to arrive regularly. And it might also be well for the Catholic masses of New York to consider whether there is not some way to reduce the extortionate charges for burials in Calvary cemetery; whether there is not some way of giving the people who support the churches some control over their own property, and whether it is wise to place so much public money, as now goes to Catholic institutions, in the hands of those who are engaged in teaching the slavish doctrine that American Catholics are not merely ecclesiastical, but political, "subjects."

We are to have a six-million-dollar Protestant Episcopal cathedral in New York, and Prior Glynn, the Italianized Irishman who induced Davitt to apologize to Simeoni, has collected a lot of money to honor St. Patrick by adding another to the four hundred churches that already exist in Rome. The pope has sent to Queen Victoria, in charge of three monsignori who are to be made bishops to further emphasize the gift, a magnificent mosaic worth a considerable part of the Peter's pence that will come to him this year from suffering Ireland. Westminster abbey is being lined with scaffolding from which some thousands of people who never did a day's work in their lives and some sixty representatives of "the working classes" are to witness the grand pageant which commemorates the queen's jubilee. And Trinity church, New York, in grateful remembrance of the act of "her gracious majesty's" predecessor in giving that corporation the right to draw an immense income from the labor of the present generation of New Yorkers, is to celebrate the same event by grand choral services.

Consider the tenement houses of New York; consider the "jubilee" evictions in Ireland; consider the misery that festers in London, where philanthropists are getting up farthing dinners! What would Patrick, the swineherd and missionary—what would John, the divine—what would Christ, the carpenter's son—say to all this were they here to-day?

Said Christ our Lord, "I will go and see. How the men, my brethren, believe in me." He passed not again through the gate of birth, but made himself known to the children of earth.

Then said the chief priests, and rulers, and kings, "Behold, now, the Giver of all good things; Go to, let us welcome with pomp and state Him who alone is mighty and great!"

With carpets of gold the ground they spread. Wherever the Son of Man should tread, And in palace chambers lofty and rare They lodged him, and served him with kingly fare.

Great organs surged, through arches dim Their jubilant floods in praise of him; And in church, and palace, and judgment hall, He saw his image high over all.

But still, wherever his steps they led, The Lord in sorrow bent down his head, And from under the heavy foundation stones, The Son of Mary heard bitter groans.

And in church, and palace, and judgment hall, He marked great fissures that rent the wall, And opened wider and yet more wide As the living foundation heaved and sighed. "Have ye founded your thrones and altars, then,

On the bodies and souls of living men? And think ye that building shall endure, Which shelters the noble and crushes the poor?"

"With gates of silver and bars of gold Ye have fenced my sheep from their Father's fold: I have heard the dropping of their tears In heaven these eighteen hundred years."

"O Lord and Master, not ours the guilt, We build but as our fathers built; Behold thine images, how they stand, Sovereign and sole, through all our land."

"Our task is hard—with sword and flame To hold thine earth forever the same, And with sharp crooks of steel to keep Still, as thou ledest them, thy sheep."

Then Christ sought out an artisan, A low-browed, stunted, haggard man, And a motherless girl, whose fingers thit Pushed from her faintly want and sin.

These set he in the midst of them, And as they drew back their garment hem, For fear of defilement, "Lo, here," said he, "The images ye have made of Me!"

—James Russell Lowell.

By and by there may arise here a cathedral worthy of a great metropolis—a cathedral grander and more graceful than those which yet stand in England, mementoes of a time when there were no paupers in the land, and no one need fear that he could not make a living—a "poem in stone" that shall express, not the ostentation of a sect, but the faith of a people. This generation will hardly build it. Other work must be done before that can come.

An artist sends me a pen and ink drawing of striking power and suggestiveness. A high, heavily buttressed wall supports the foundation of an esplanade, from which arise stately palaces and porticoes. Reclining around a well covered table a party of revelers raise high their goblets as they toast each other, and preceded by cymbals and trumpets, and carried in couches resting on men's shoulders and sheltered by peacocks' fans borne above their heads, other guests are approaching. On the coping of the wall a jester has stretched himself as if for a nap, and a coquettishly dressed serving maid who has set down a tray of refreshments, stands in listless attitude with hand on hip, both looking with most languid interest on what is going on below. There a group of emaciated, half-naked wretches bend in resigned adoration or prostrate themselves in prayer before the face of the wall. Mounted on a ladder, stretching from the lower ground tenanted by the starving wretches to the top of the wall, a monk in the habit of one of the preaching orders, whose burly form prevents any one else from climbing up, is standing painting. He has painted a maze of angels' wings and clustering heads of cherubs, and is now engaged in filling in a figure of Christ, while over all he has painted the words, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

This drawing, which expresses at a glance more than many words could say, is typical of the frame of mind of many men who have come to hate religion because they have seen it made the bulwark of injustice, and to war against the very idea of a future state because it has seemed to them that the hope of heaven was used to make men submissive under wrongs on this earth.

The artist—I never knew him before—who sends me this says:

I send you a drawing once intended for publication, but fortunately never used. I am glad it was not used, for I now feel like saying to that noble man, McGlynn: "Almost thou persuadedst me to be a Christian!" Nay, in all but that kindly, reverent faith of his in the supernatural I hope I am. I accept Christ as the type of humanity and of the highest love of the good.

It was from the hearts of men like this—men who in their soul's hunger have asked of the churches bread and been given a stone, that there burst that joyous shout, that storm of exultant applause which none who heard will easily forget, that at the first meeting of the Anti-poverty society greeted the words, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth," as they fell from the lips of the priest who stands under the shadow of excommunication because he will not deny the truth and give up the hope and the struggle for the reign of justice here.

Let Rome excommunicate this priest, if it will. There is behind him what made the Pantheon a Christian temple; what planted the cross on Tara's hill.

HENRY GEORGE.

Let the Big Boycott Come.

SKANEATELES FALLS, N. Y., June 12.—I attended the lecture of Dr. McGlynn at Syracuse on the 5th inst. He is full of sincerity and earnestness that shows a soul full of love to God and man. He has thrown himself with the masses, to be sacrificed and made a burnt offering for their interests and welfare that will let a new flood of light shine on the world. Well, let the big boycott come. It will greatly help to spread the light. Truth and justice must prevail. M. I. MEAGHER.

The Struggle Must Go On.

NEWTON, Kan., June 11.—Whether Dr. McGlynn be excommunicated or not, the struggle will go on until all men and women shall be free, whether they be Catholics or Protestants, and the sooner the Corrigan and the would-be saviors of society understand this the better for all concerned.

O. P. ANDERSON.

The McGlynn Fund.

THE STANDARD has received from Mr. Carew of the Carpenters' association fifty dollars for the McGlynn fund.

ANTI-POVERTY.

ANOTHER CROWDED HOUSE AT THE SOCIETY'S SEVENTH MEETING.

An Impressive Address by Dr. McGlynn—A Short Speech by Mr. James J. Gahan—Questions Answered by Louis F. Post.

Last Sunday evening the Academy of Music was again crowded in every part, people standing three and four deep behind the last rows of seats. The programme was one of more variety than usual. Mr. W. T. Crossdale was the chairman. He announced that as Dr. McGlynn was to take a train for Auburn at a few minutes past 9 o'clock every moment possible would be given him after his arrival. Miss Munier's chorus then began singing "The Cross of the New Crusade," but had finished only one verse when Dr. McGlynn came upon the stage. The cheering that greeted him was loud and long. The doctor waited until it was possible to control it, which he did by signaling for silence by a gesture of the hand. His manner in beginning his address, while utterly unaffected, was deeply impressive, and as he proceeded it became touching. His voice, always pleasant, was clear and musical, and as he clothed in choice language the lofty sentiments that animated him, his audience at times seemed spellbound—lost in admiration of his truth, courage, conscience and splendid talents. A man's voice called out loudly, just as he was about to begin, "God bless you, Dr. McGlynn!" and there was not one who beheld him and thought of his high purpose and sterling manhood but echoed the same prayer in his heart. Dr. McGlynn said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—Your kind and flattering applause does not elate me. It fills me with a strange sense of responsibility. It is a dangerous thing for any man to be very much applauded. We must all be conscious how weak, how imperfect and how impotent we are, except so far as we become instruments in the hands of Him who disposes of all things most powerfully and most sweetly for His own most worthy ends. (Hear! hear! and applause.) Your excessive kindness to me lays a most sacred obligation upon me (applause); it obliges me to be careful of every word that I utter; to think seriously of everything that I do, to make no misstep if I can avoid it.

It is particularly incumbent upon us when we would do anything great or good for the interests of justice and for the interests of humanity, to remember that we are but instruments in the hands of another; that we are but mere instruments upon which the Master must play and sweep the chords and touch the keys, inspire the thoughts and give the fit and the apt and expressive word, so that the truth may be communicated from mind to mind; and the impulse to love and to promote a great cause may spread like wildfire. After we have accomplished great things, after we have raised the banner high in the name of Christ, we have, after all, but to acknowledge that we are unworthy servants. So your applause is preaching to me a good sermon. It is teaching me my duty. I ask not so much your applause, but your sympathy and prayers that I may be a little less unworthy of your applause (great applause) and that I shall be stimulated by your applause, by the confidence you seem to repose in my judgment, by the perfect confidence that you seem to have in the integrity of my motives (great applause), to be allowed more carefully to weigh every thought and judgment, to be slow to speak words that might be misunderstood; in a word, to do nothing that may bring a single stain upon the fair white banner of our crusade (cries of "Hear, hear," and applause), or be in the least degree unworthy of the benediction of Him from whose sacred sign of redemption we have taken the symbol of our holy war. (Applause.)

I am profoundly impressed with the comparative nothingness of time, with the comparatively trifling character of the things, the toys, the children's playthings, the child's rattle, the sugar candy, that men call pleasure and business and politics and statecraft, and dignity with the name of affairs, except so far as all these things that busy the brain and torment the heart and engross the fancy of men are signs and symbols of spiritual things.

The things of time and sense have no value, except so far as they are the outward manifestation, the remembrance and the prophetic expression of the things of the soul, of the things of eternity. The ideal is the real, the eternal. The ideal truth and justice and goodness and beauty are the real. And these things that seem to us alone real are but the imperfect and transitory outward manifestations and expressions of the eternal reality which is in the mind of God. Things here are true not because they are here, but because they are a transcript of the eternal idea in the mind of God. Our knowledge of these things is borrowed from the things themselves, but the truth of these things is not in themselves, but in their conformity with the eternal truth, with the ideal in the mind of the Creator. (Applause.)

It is the teaching of Christian philosophy that not only is it necessary that there should be an infinite and eternal and all-wise Creator in order that anything should have begun to be, but also that there must be the constant, never failing concurrence of the Creator in order to prevent all things from instantly falling into nothingness. There is only one Being in the whole universe that has the reason of his being in Himself, and that is God. All other things would instantly, by the very necessity of their nature, fall into non-existence, if God should but for an instant withdraw His concurrence and His supporting hand.

One who is full of this thought, of this true philosophy of the teachings of this Christian metaphysics, surely must be impressed with an overwhelming sense of the importance of the things of eternity, of the importance of the ideal world, of the world of perfect justice and truth and goodness and beauty, and must find worthy objects in the pursuits of time only so far as they are the signs and symbols and means for the accomplishment of the things of eternity. (Applause.)

This is religion. This is the teaching of the Christian schools. This is the teaching of the

Christ. Now, then, so far from our crusade being of such a nature as to draw men away from God; from the pursuit of spiritual things; from intense and ardent love of the unseen truth, and goodness and beauty, by teaching them to covet more the things of this world, to prize them more highly and to devote themselves more unreservedly to the attainment of them at the expense of higher and better things, we assert, and must never tire of asserting, that a large part of the purpose of this crusade is to bring men nearer to God (applause); is to teach men that the apparently trifling and otherwise unworthy pursuits of time—the daily tasks, the unbecoming burdens that weigh upon the human life—must be without an adequate purpose if a sacramental value were not given to them by the moral nature and the spiritual dignity of man, investing them with ideal truth and goodness and beauty. So

that we, by performing these tasks of time; by the patient and loving bearing of these burdens that the Father has laid upon us; by the constant treading day after day in the weary way of duty, no matter how humble or how undistinguished it may be, are but performing duties which, when regarded from the moral side, when seen by those who look down from the kingdom of God, take on a dignity, a grace, a charm, a benediction, that never could be in the things of time, except so far as they have reference to the things of eternity.

For those of us who take this view, every step is counted by the angels of God, every cross becomes inexhaustibly precious, every task has its eternal reward. We feel that we are weaving here a wondrous tapestry, which can be enjoyed by those who are on the other side. We are weaving thread after thread in apparent confusion; but He who has planned the task, who has designed all the destinies of the universe, in giving us the moral law that we are to obey even when we cannot see its full purpose or the beneficent ends that it is ultimately to attain, bids us go on in perfect faith that somewhere, some time, somehow, the tapestry that we are weaving shall be placed in its proper frame, and even we shall be permitted to see the perfect beauty of the design, the wondrous work of art, the wondrous creation that shall have been made by human beings in humble, lowly fulfilling of the tasks that have been assigned to them by duty. (Applause.)

The whole human family is composing and performing a magnificent oratorio that is sending up a wondrous ascription of praise to the Creator. (Applause.) The silent performance of duty, the humble love of spiritual things, the temptation secretly and successfully resisted, the charity to others not because of the loveliness we may find in them, but because on every human being we find stamped the image of the Creator (applause); all these things lend a grace and a dignity to our lives and give a ready answer to the skeptical question, "Is life worth the living, is the battle worth the fighting, is the burden worth the bearing?"

Yes, the battle is worth the fighting! And those who understand the magnificent objects that are to be obtained by the victorious fighting of the battle of life, the very strife itself takes on a fierce delight; and we feel that it is better to battle, to receive many a wound, to bear upon our souls and upon our bodies the scar of many a conflict as we shall enter the portals of our Father's kingdom to hear from Him the acknowledgement of our well-earned triumph for having fought His battle. (Great applause.) The burden is worth the bearing through the heat of the day, through the arid wilderness, in spite of hunger and thirst, in spite of the mockery of those who, self-indulgent, lie in the shade and wonder that we should continue in the performance of a task for which there seems to be for a time so little and so unworthy a reward. This burden is worth the bearing if we have the assurance that, somehow, sometime, we shall be able to lay it down at the feet of the Father, to learn from Him the secret why he has asked us to bear it, and to receive the assurance that, having borne it well and faithfully for His dear sake, and after the example of Him who by our Father was made the exemplar, the teacher of humanity—we shall deserve an everlasting reward. (Applause.)

It was the perception, the clear perception of these great truths that made him whom we honor ourselves by calling our guide, our philosopher and our leader, Mr. Henry George (great applause), say that in the heart of these supposed nihilists, anarchists, dynamiters, in spite of their hatred of so much that is good, in spite of a spirit that at times may seem satanic in its blind desire for revenge, in spite of a spirit that would seem so destructive to the conservative and at times absolutely atheistic—that there is for all that more of the essence of religion in them than in many of those who sit in the foremost places in the synagogue and thank God that they are not like the rest of mankind (applause and cheers), socialists, atheists, dynamiters, followers of Henry George (laughter and applause), engaged in a Quixotic crusade.

And yet it was not the purpose, the intent, the thought of Mr. Henry George, and no more is it my thought or purpose, to justify the excesses of nihilists or socialists or dynamiters, whatever they may be. But what we have said, and what, in spite of obloquy, we shall not be afraid to say again and again (great applause), is this: That the very rage, the very fury, the very apparent satanic hatred of the nihilist and the dynamiter is a magnificent tribute of the spiritual and better part of man to the god-given instinct of justice. (Applause.) Take away injustice, preach to the dynamiter, to the extreme socialist, to the nihilist, of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man (applause); teach him that the crimes that outrage him, that make him so bitter against the existing order of things, are not the result of the law of God, but are the necessary penalty, the self-inflicted, the natural penalty of the violation of God's law—and he ceases to be the dynamiter (applause); he ceases to be the atheist; he takes on a reverent and a loving spirit; his sense of justice is satisfied, and he is the more willing to work by peaceful, lawful and constitutional means for the rights of the wronged, for the preaching of the gospel of truth, until we shall have attained a majority of the voters (applause), who shall constitutionally and lawfully re-write the laws and satisfy the cravings for absolute equal justice among men. (Great applause.)

We are talking about nihilists, social extremists, dynamiters, in this favored land of ours. We can persuade them—we have succeeded already in persuading not a few—to take on a different spirit. When they are permitted to see, like a gleam or a ray of light, that by constitutional means these reforms may be accomplished, they will be patient until they are given such constitutional and lawful means. We are not talking about other countries, that, unfortunately for them, are different from ours, where constitutional justice does not exist, where even petition is considered a crime, where the despotic spirit of one man makes him the lawgiver and absolute master of a hundred millions of people (hisses); it is idle for us to prate to such as are subject to so brutal a despotism, of lawful and constitutional agitation; where even a respectful petition to the despot may be considered as an insult to offended majesty (hisses); where the construction to be put upon the petition and the penalty to be awarded to the petitioner are left with the unrestrained will of a despot. Will some one be kind enough to tell us what will be the constitutional and lawful remedy by which the people of Russia can accomplish their necessary reforms? (Voices from all over the hall, "Dynamite, dynamite," and applause. Another voice, "Send Bayard there.")

It is very painful and humiliating for us to observe how strangely the tone and the temper of very many of our American fellow citizens have changed within a few years; how rapidly the spirit of the fierce democracy has died out; how it has become fashionable to admire and to toady to despotism anywhere and everywhere (applause); how it has become the correct thing to congratulate and to honor any wretched scion of the ruling family of the unfortunate country to which we have just been alluding; how a great many Americans consider it a great honor to be admitted to make a bow before the presence of crowned majesty (hisses); how it has got to be one of

the dearest objects of the heart of some American fathers and mothers to wed their daughters to men whom they have to bribe with a good round sum of money to condescend to honor American girls with the touch of their hands, and with the imparting of their inherited titles of nobility. (Hisses and laughter.)

A friend of mine from San Francisco, California, was visiting Rome some years ago, when a young ecclesiastic came to him on a matrimonial embassy from an antiquated Roman duke, the great great grandson of a pope. I happen to know all about the story, and was intimately acquainted with the parties, for the lady in question happened to be my own niece. This Benedictine monk came with a serious proposal to the father of the child to the effect that if he would put down four hundred thousand dollars the duke would condescend to marry the girl and impart to her the title of a duchess. I am happy to say that the proposal was not accepted (applause), although it came through so eminently respectable and ecclesiastical a channel. (Laughter.)

Now, then, I think it will be one of the magnificent objects to be attained by this crusade that it will revive the spirit of American republicanism and democracy. (Applause.) It teaches, as a matter of political economy, sound philosophy and true religion, that the liberty and the equality of men (applause) spoken of in our magnificent Declaration of Independence (applause) are in wondrous consonance with the very spirit of the gospel of Christ. This is the gospel of the new crusade (applause), the equal brotherhood of man, the equal rights of all men to the general bounties that God the Creator has spread out so lavishly for the use, the comfort and the instruction of His children. (Applause.)

Our movement is necessarily a moral one. We must appeal to the sentiments of the masses as against the classes. We must be in sympathy with the poorest, the lowliest. We must necessarily be on our guard against aristocrats. We must necessarily believe that it will be as hard for a true aristocrat to enter heart and soul into this movement as it is, by the very teaching of the Master Himself, difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. (Applause.)

Dr. McGlynn brought his short address to a conclusion with the announcement that he was obliged to catch a train in order to keep an engagement for the morrow in Auburn, N. Y.

The chairman then made several announcements of meetings during the coming week. He said that the audience that was present and cheered McGlynn to the echo did not look as if the doctor was very much isolated. He then alluded to the parade and mass meeting that was to be given in honor of Dr. McGlynn on the following Saturday, and said that the Anti-poverty society had at its last business meeting resolved to participate in a body. He also invited the audience and their friends to participate, and requested them all to meet at Irving hall at six o'clock on the afternoon of Saturday to arrange for the parade. The society will have one of the places of honor in the procession. St. Stephen's parishioners having the first place.

The chairman also announced that next Sunday evening the Anti-poverty society will have two meetings, one in the Academy of Music and one in Irving hall, each of which will be addressed by Dr. McGlynn, Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost and Mr. Henry George.

The choir then sang "Land and Labor," and Mr. Crossdale introduced the author of the song, Mr. James J. Gahan, who was received with great applause, and said:

Mr. Chairman Ladies and Gentlemen—While I was sitting here this evening I could not but congratulate myself upon the fact that I had a very peaceably-disposed gentleman sitting beside me. Within a week or two, in this city, it has become suddenly fashionable for men who style themselves Irish nationalists to denounce dynamiters, and remembering that resource of civilization which has occupied the pages of so many of our New York papers during the past week, I could not but congratulate myself upon the fact that I had such a very peaceably disposed individual as my friend Mr. Redpath (applause) sitting between me and my very good friend, that awful dynamiter, John McMacKin. (Applause.)

The position which has been assigned to me this evening by the executive committee of this Anti-poverty society fills me with embarrassment. To follow the great man who has planted the cross of the new crusade on the hilltops of our consciences, is to bring forth in sharp contrast the richness of his life and the poverty of my own. (Applause.) But in this crusade there is room and work for all. There is room and work for such a great man as all acknowledge our great crusader to be. (applause.) There is room and work for one who is as humble as I am. There is room and work for all who believe in doing their duty toward their fellow men, independent of the sneers of a hostile press, and always ready to repel and resist the advances of corrupt politicians and political halls. (Applause.)

We have heard uttered on this platform great truths; and a speaker in this new crusade can, perhaps more than most men, realize what must have been the feeling of the Hebrew emancipator when he heard from out the burning bush the words which told him that the round on which he stood was holy. And grand and holy is this spot, because here a grand and a holy man has stood preaching and teaching the great truths of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; teaching us that as God is no respecter of persons He cannot extend his benediction over hearts which do not respect persons; teaching us that if we are to fulfill our duty, if we are to carry out the mission of our hearts and souls in its fullest and completest sense, we must be prepared to carry on a battle for truth, for justice, for right among men, a combat for liberty, equality and fraternity, an undying struggle against the apologists—be they ecclesiastical or lay, I care not—of the system which creates classes and which oppresses the masses. (Applause.)

And how does this Anti-poverty society propose to accomplish this mission? By infusing into the hearts and the minds and the consciences of men the great fact that there cannot be any other than a hideous and horrid system of things existing until all men rise up in their might and dignity, and bring about by their own acts the restoration of natural justice among men. (Applause.)

It is, my friends, a magnificent mission, and it is a mission which is not likely to down at the bidding of the politicians of this or any other city. (Applause.) And why? Because we have hung out our banner inscribed with these great words, that poverty, that crime, that misery, must exist and cannot be eradicated until all the bounties of nature created for the use of all men are thrown open to all and made free of access to all. (Cries of "Hear! hear!" and applause.)

In other words, as has been said on this platform by Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn and Mr. Pentecost, we want the earth, and with nothing less than the earth will we be satisfied. (Applause.) We want the land for the people (applause); and in making our demand for the restoration of the land to the people, we do so with a firm resolve and a fixed determination never to allow any mere expediency or any mere tricks of opportunism to make us lower that fair banner or enter upon compromises with the devil and with wrong. We have seen in a newspaper published in

this city this morning, a newspaper largely read by the countrymen and countrywomen of Michael Davitt, an most extraordinary statement. The editor makes a faint effort, a very silly attempt, to prove that the utterances of Bishop Nulty have not been correctly or fully quoted, but have been garbled by those on this side of the Atlantic who believe in the doctrine of the land for the people. And in order to make good his strange and silly case, he tells us that the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland have had a meeting recently, and that they declared that the only just and fair settlement of the land question at the present time over there in Ireland would be for the government to buy out the landlords' interest in the soil and then relet that soil to those of the people who desire to occupy it, at a rent much below that which the landlords are now enabled to obtain for it. The editor says, "There is not a word about land nationalization in this" (Laughter.) Why, do not the very words of the resolution declare that in the opinion of the bishops and archbishops of Ireland, the land of the country should be bought out by the government? What is the government? The government is the state, the government is the people. That it should be relet to those who desire to occupy it, relet by whom? Relet by the government, by the state, by the people, back to the people, with rents to be paid back to the people, back to the state, back to the government, in order to carry on the functions of government. (Applause.) And with the exception of the very vicious doctrine of the resolution that the land thieves now in occupancy should be compensated, there is not a single essential feature of difference between the land theory as preached upon this platform and the land theory as declared just, equitable, wise and judicious by the assembly of archbishops and bishops of Ireland. (Applause.)

My friends, on this platform to follow me there is a gentleman who deserves always at the hands of the people in this city a royal welcome—no, an anti-poverty welcome; and I believe that he will much better be able to interest and, above all, to instruct you, and to regular attendance at these meetings, that is usual. And for the purpose of enabling him to be assailed from all quarters of this vast audience with questions pertinent to the issue, I will retire, first thanking you for the friendly attention you have given me, and at the same time joining my voice with that of your worthy chairman in the hope that not a single member of the Anti-poverty society, not a single friend of the society, man or woman, will be found absent next Saturday evening, but will be there (applause) to tell that marble hearted archbishop (hisses) who lives in that marble hall, to tell those people over in Rome (hisses) that the day has passed, if that day ever existed, when he or they could or can with impunity dare to lay their sacrilegious hands upon the ark of American freedom, the American ballot box! (Applause.)

Chairman Crossdale then introduced Mr. Louis F. Post, and announced that he would answer such questions pertinent to the object of the meeting as anyone might choose to put.

Mr. Post said: Ladies and Gentlemen: Without any vanity, I confess that I am very much embarrassed by the duty which your committee has assigned to me to-night; and I assure you now that I shall not undertake to perform that duty in full. I do not propose to set myself up as a prize answerer of conundrums. But I will tell you what I will do. If there is any one in this audience who has any doubt upon this subject, who has any objection to make to our propositions, who is seriously inquiring into the subject, and who in that spirit will ask a question, I will answer him here and now if I can. If I cannot answer him here and now I will look into the question and see that he gets an answer, if there is one. And if his question is a vital question, and after consideration and reflection cannot be answered, then that is the end of our crusade. (Applause.)

We see about us a condition of poverty, and it is from that point that we start. Poverty in the midst of plenty; poverty among the people who work, and plenty among the people who are idle. (Applause.) And our attention is attracted by this anomaly. How can it be? We know that there are no material things that we enjoy in this world that are not produced by human labor and maintained by human labor. Then how happens it that he who works from morning until night is in poverty, and he who does not work day and night is rich? He pleases is in wealth? How happens it? That is the question that we have put to ourselves, and it is the question that we put to you.

We are told sometimes that if men would only be moral and honest and industrious there would be no poverty. But we know that the work, the industry and the honesty of the masses will not abolish poverty so long as the classes have possession of the source of wealth without which no wealth can be produced. (Applause.) We have traced poverty in the world to the private ownership of the earth. So long as the earth can be privately owned, so long will we have poverty, and so long will poverty increase and spread and intensify. And it is for that reason that we propose to get the earth back again. (Applause.) We do not intend to divide this earth up. That is not necessary nor desirable. So long as there is no such thing as rent, any one can take what land he wants. Then there would be no necessity for an anti-poverty society. Slavery takes a different form then—the form of chattel slavery. But under present conditions one needs not to own men, for he who owns the land owns the men who must live on and out of the land.

What we want is the rent, the rent of the land. No land has rent until two men want it; and as the number of men who want it increases, the rent increases. That we have noticed, and that you can notice all about you, all over the civilized world. Rent is produced by no man; it is born of the competition of men for the privilege of using the earth on which they live.

Now we say we will take that rent for the people. How shall we take it? We propose to take it by the present methods of taxation. We will abolish all taxes save taxes on land values. We will abolish taxes on all products of labor, and put taxes on land values and increase those taxes as the values of the land grow until he who says I own this ground may say so, but it won't do him any good. (Applause.) But we do not propose that those taxes shall absorb the whole rental value at once. We propose at the beginning merely to shift present taxation. That is enough. That raises the whole question. We have no right to tax one class of property and exempt all other classes. We concede that any man would have a right to object—landlords would have a right to object and say, "You must not tax my property and exempt other kinds of property." Very well, we agree to that. And so, before we have a right to shift taxation, we must prove that land cannot belong to any one man exclusive of other men.

So, in order merely to shift taxation, we have got to take upon our shoulders the whole burden of the fight, and prove that the land of a country belongs of right to the people of that country. (Applause.) Therefore, all we want at the start is to shift present taxes. After we have got that far there will

be no trouble—it will only be a matter of detail—to increase the tax, and no man can make a fortune thereafter by putting a fence around land and going to bed.

Now, I repeat that I won't promise to answer every question, but every question will receive attention; and any question that I cannot answer at once I will answer through the query column of THE STANDARD, if it can be answered. Now fire away.

The following questions were then showered upon Mr. Post in rapid succession, and he as quickly answered them. The first was:

Q.—An editorial in the Brooklyn Eagle of June 10, winds up with the statement that if the community is the creator of the value of land, it is equally the creator of the value of personal property; and the principle that demands that the value of land be returned to the people would demand that the value of personal property be returned, which is downright communism. I myself, understand it, but many do not. I would, therefore, like to have you clearly explain it, and everything connected with it. (Applause.)

Mr. Post.—The value of all products of labor is determined by labor. No product of labor can for any length of time be worth any more than it will cost to reproduce that article. If a dollar, for instance, is worth two thousand dollars, measured by labor, that house cannot for any length of time be worth more than two thousand dollars, because labor can reproduce it at the same cost. But when land has acquired a value of two thousand dollars, you will have to go a great way for the laborer who can reproduce that land for that cost. (Great applause.) The value of land is not determined by labor, but by demand for the land. If there had been two men on Robinson Crusoe's island, and one man had built a house, for instance, and another had raised a goat, and they had each devoted the same time to their different works, the value of the house would have been the value of the goat. Labor would have determined that value. But there would have been no value to land. No land has value until the best land is appropriated and inferior lands must be resorted to. (Applause.)

Q.—When you tax a land owner, how will you prevent him from raising his rent?

Mr. Post.—We will raise his taxes. The difficulty with you is that you think the tax on land values can be shifted off upon the community. A tax upon land values cannot be shifted upon the community. It is the only kind of a tax that cannot be so shifted. The rent of land is determined by the margin of production, which I need not explain here, as it would take too much time, and rent is always up to the mark—it is all that the traffic will bear. The landlord is not particular to have a tax imposed in order to raise rent. (Applause.) When you can afford to pay more your landlord will call just before the expiration of your lease; and he will talk of how your business prospers, and will say, "I know of other men who would like this place, but I like you and will give you the first call. Improvements are going up all around and I must raise you a little." He don't wait for any increase of taxation in order to raise the rent. (Great applause.)

Q.—My brother is a farmer. He has a small farm, but the richest farmer in the county has sold his farm and put all his money in government bonds. He pays no taxes, and my brother on his small farm has to educate his children and pay taxes besides.

Mr. Post.—I am in favor of putting an end to bonds of that kind. (A voice: "That is right.") Applause. Those bonds represent powder that was used up twenty-five years ago. They represent no existing capital. I will not say, and it is not necessary, what I would do with those particular bonds; but the next time they come around asking us to make bonds to carry on war, we will say to those people that, inasmuch as we have drafted men we propose to draft capital, too. (Applause.) That is not a question of taking taxes off of capital. That question relates to another method of robbery, of which rent is the mother. I am a little in doubt whether we had better pay those bonds off and get rid of the leeches, or cut them off. However, the Anti-poverty society has not taken any stand on that question, and when our ground rents are restored to us we shall be rich enough to pay off our old bonds and begin fresh.

Q.—Suppose A owns a piece of property on one side of the street, and B owns a piece on the opposite side. A, who is a very rich man, builds a magnificent hotel upon his piece of property. He derives rent from letting out the rooms; while B, who is a poor man and has his own little place on this side, has to pay the same amount of taxes?

Mr. Post.—I do not know of any such case except in the imagination of Mayor Hewitt. But suppose there were such a case—the poor man, occupying a valuable piece of ground that lots of people want, is not a poor man at all; he is a mere speculator in land. (Applause.) He is entitled to no consideration because he is a poor man. He is speculating in land values, and he expects to get rich by occupying ground that other people want.

The searcher after truth returned to the charge as follows:

Q.—That does not satisfy me, Mr. Post. B is a man who has saved enough to buy a dwelling on the other side of the street. A has had enough money left him by his ancestors to build a magnificent hotel on the other side. By letting that out to boarders and others he derives a large revenue. Should B pay the same amount of taxes as A?

Mr. Post.—You think because A has got more of the products of labor than B has that it is unjust that he should pay no more taxes. I will give you an illustration. Oil wells are land. Suppose one man has got a whole lot of oil out of one well and that a poor man owning an equally valuable well has not got any oil out of it. The rich man has barrels and barrels of oil stored away. Now, we would tax the two men the same. You would come back at us and say this rich man should be taxed for the barrels of oil he has stored away. But we would say for the oil that has been stored away so long as we can put our hands on the source of the oil. The stored oil won't last long; it isn't worth while bothering with that. Let us get at the land, and then the things that have been taken from the land cannot last much longer. They will all in the process of time decay or be consumed and go back again to the land. (Applause.)

Q.—What particular advantage is to be gained by an individual who lives in a tenement house to-day if the taxes are shifted from the building, the improvement, and placed on the land? Wouldn't his rent still remain the same, inasmuch as his landlord would have control of the house?

Mr. Post.—His great advantage will be that he will not have to live in a tenement house. When you tax land values, all that is not required for use and is consequently vacant will be substantially free. And with all vacant land freed, no man need live in a tenement house. (Applause.) Tenement houses will give place to homes.

Q.—Will land owners stand the proposed tax on land values? Will they not resist such a tax, and cause a terrible and bloody war?

Mr. Post.—If they want to go into the anarchy business we can take care of them. When the taxes are shifted to land values, I do not think there will be any difficulty. But if there should be, we will be strong enough to put down the law breakers. Q.—At a recent debate there was a point

made against this theory that I would like to have you answer. It was this—that if the taxes were shifted to land, it would destroy the insurance companies and trust companies that have large mortgages on land.

Mr. Post.—I remember hearing that point made. Of course there is a great variety of points raised in behalf of special interests. Such points are raised during the anti-slavery contest. Present taxes must first be shifted, and when we see the advantage of that, taxes will be increased until rental value is entirely absorbed. I think that during the process of shifting there will be a shifting of securities, so that no great loss will fall upon any one. I don't think that absolutely; but I don't think that there will be any great damage done to those interests. At any rate, such interests cannot weigh against the absolute right of every child that comes into this world to his share of the earth. (Great applause.)

Q.—Will you please define original ownership to anything, and the whys and wherefores?

Mr. Post.—I might make a speech all night on that. Briefly, the right to own a thing flows from the production of that thing. A man who makes any product of labor owns it while it remains in that form. From the time that he withdraws the material from nature until it returns to the earth again, the object in the shape which he has given it belongs to him. His ownership relates to the production of the materials from the earth and their transformation into a form that meets his desire; and so long as they remain in that form—until they return to the original source again—he has ownership in the object. That is my idea of ownership, and beyond that ownership cannot go. (Applause.)

Q.—We will suppose that taxes are shifted to land values. What will prevent the farmers from combining and charging shoemakers two days' pay for one of their own, so that they will not have to work more than one day themselves?

Mr. Post.—Too many farmers and too few shoemakers. (Applause.)

Q.—I say that the gentleman who wants to know what original ownership was ought to read "Progress and Poverty."

Mr. Post.—You all ought to do that.

Q.—At present, under the constitution, is it legal to sell land? Does the spirit of the constitution of the United States permit the sale of land?

Mr. Post.—You know what that fellow in jail said when the lawyer told him, "He can't put you in jail," and showed him so in Blackstone. "You infernal fool," said the prisoner, "I am in jail." (Laughter.)

Q.—Suppose three brothers are on three different pieces of land. One was industrious, but he had a large family of children to educate, clothe, and so forth; the second was a worthy single man; the third was supposed to be a perfect gambler—squandered his money, etc. Of course the man with the large family had very little money—in fact, could not pay his rent; the second could pay his rent, and had plenty of money the third could pay his rent, but wouldn't?

Mr. Post.—As to the man that had a large family and who had to pay a heavy tax if the land was worth it and he could not pay it, he need not keep that land, for he would find plenty of other land that did not have any tax at all. As to the brother that was paying the tax, the advantage of his tax would go to the brother that did not pay. What he lost as a tenant he would gain as a landlord. By the way, what happens in such cases under the present system? (Applause.)

Q.—What would you do with the gambler?

Mr. Post.—Except gambling for fun, there wouldn't be any occasion for gambling. When you can make a living decently and honestly, all the incentives to gambling, except as an amusement, will be lost. (Applause.)

The following telegram from the Anti-poverty meeting in Philadelphia was received after the meeting had adjourned:

Three thousand Quakers send fraternal greetings to their New York brothers and sisters. The cross of the new crusade has been raised in Philadelphia.

W. J. ATKINSON,
President Anti-poverty society.

Dr. McGlynn's Lectures.

On Thursday evening of last week Dr. McGlynn spoke at Hoosick Falls, and on Friday at Oswego. He had been invited to both places by the Knights of Labor and had large audiences. His engagements for the present week were at Auburn on Monday, at Rochester on Tuesday, at Elmira on Wednesday, at Port Jervis on Thursday, at Middletown on Friday. At Auburn the Academy of Music was crowded. Among those present were Mayor Austin, Judge Cady, Rev. J. J. Brayton, Rev. C. C. Hemenway, Rev. Arthur Copeland, Rev. F. H. Hinman, John W. O'Brien, B. B. Snow, T. J. Seales and Dr. West. Wherever the doctor has visited in the state he has brought many within the folds of the party of the land for the people. The opposing newspapers all concede his sincerity of purpose and admire his eloquence. Letters are constantly being received at room 32, Cooper union, telling of his effective work in many places.

PHILADELPHIA'S ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

McCaull's opera house in Philadelphia was crowded in every part last Sunday evening at the first public meeting of the branch of the Anti-poverty society of that city. President William J. Atkinson called the meeting to order and explained the objects of the society. Henry George spoke on "The Cause and Cure of Poverty." At the close of his address numerous questions were put to him by people in the audience. A collection amounting to \$115 was taken up. The audience was enthusiastic throughout the evening, evidently having caught the spirit of the parent society. Another meeting will be held on Sunday evening next, at which Louis F. Post will be present.

THE PACKARD STUDENTS AND HENRY GEORGE.

It is the custom of the students of Packard's business college to take up for discussion on Friday mornings some of the burning questions of the day, the object being more especially to incite the young mind to more general reading and thinking. For some weeks past they have been discussing private ownership of land. Finally, in order to settle certain differences of opinion which had arisen in the discussion, Mr. Packard suggested that Mr. George be invited to be present on the next occasion, and to answer such questions as might be puzzling the minds of the young people. Mr. George attended to the request, and on Friday, May 13, met a large lecture room full of students and their friends. Mr. Packard had formulated a few of the leading questions which had been presented to him in the previous discussions, and opened the exercises by reading these questions in their order. Mr. George responded as they were read. After this more formal opening the matter of questions passed into the hands of the pupils, who spoke out freely from the spur of the moment. As the brief newspaper reports of these questions and answers have been made the subject of considerable press comment, the following verbatim report, made by the pupils of the shorthand department of Packard's, is here printed:

Q.—Under your proposition to tax land to an amount which would be equivalent to the cost of the mortgage, would not great injustice be done to owners of mortgages thereon?

A.—I don't think it would be a great injustice; but supposing there should be some injury it would be very much less than the injury now done to the community by the continuance of the present state of things, and the people who might lose somewhat as mortgagees would gain so much by the general improvement in the condition of the community that they also would be great gainers.

Q.—Has land intrinsic value?

A.—No; nothing has intrinsic value.

Q.—Does not all the value that inheres in land come from the labor of man in one direction or another?

A.—The value which attaches to land comes from the demands of men. I understand the question to be, Does not the value which inheres in land come from the labor bestowed upon that land? No, it does not. You may have a piece of land on which no labor has been bestowed, and if there is a demand for it it will have a value. Land has a value when, and not until, some one will pay for its use; in other words, if land is to be used for a productive purpose it has no value until some one, for its use, will consent to give the owner of it some portion of the product of his labor; or, to put it in another form, land has no value until two or more people want the same piece. The demand for use constitutes the real value of land, but land may also have a prospective or speculative value due to the confident expectation that in the future some one will be willing to pay for its use. For instance, land on the outskirts of the cities has a higher value than the present demand for its use would give it. This value is based on the confident expectation of the growth of the community.

Q.—Is not the private possession of land one of the greatest inducements to industry, sobriety and good citizenship?

A.—Private possession, yes; private ownership, no. Possession is necessary to the use of land. No one, for instance, will sow a crop unless there is some certainty that he shall reap it. No one will put up a house unless he has security that it may stand. No one will open a mine unless he can benefit by it. But possession is a very different thing from ownership. Many buildings in this city are put up by men who do not own the land. Nearly the whole city of London has been built in that way, the builder being one man and the land owner another. The sailors' Snag Harbor owns a great deal of land in this city, which is let out on ground rent. Buildings are erected upon it by persons who have no ownership in the land on the certainty of the possession for a given series of years. Security of possession is absolutely necessary to the best use of land, but private ownership is not. For instance, if the sailors' Snag Harbor can hold certain blocks here, retaining the ownership thereof, and yet induce people, by security of possession for a long term of years, to put up the finest buildings, so the whole land of the city of New York might be held by the corporation—that is, by the people of New York in the same way. There would then be no private ownership of the land of New York, but private improvers would have possession; a possession sufficient to give them the security necessary to improvement.

Q.—Would not the evil of putting the rental of land in the hands of the government be greater than any evil likely to come from private ownership?

A.—No; what underlies that question is the idea of the corruption of the government by the vast fund there would be to spend. But in taking the rental value of land for public purposes we could dispense with many other taxes that we now collect, and which in their very nature foster corruption, give incentives to fraud and demoralize our whole public system. Take, for instance, the principal tax by which our national government is supported, that on imports. It is a constant cause of fraud, for it tempts to get taxes levied for their benefit to spend money in politics, and to bring a pressure upon congress for the passage of laws which favor a class to the injury of the whole people. There is, besides, a source of corruption in the large number of employees required, which adds to the number of places to be filled by the adherents of the winning party. Then, again, look at the perjury, fraud and corruption involved in the collection of these duties. So it is with the taxes on personal property and improvements all over the United States.

The rich men constantly escape—in very many cases by direct bribery of the officials—in others by putting their money in politics, and in still others by perjury. All that would be swept away. The advantage of a tax levied upon land values is, in the first place, that it can be collected with certainty, and can be assessed more fairly than any other tax. Land lies out of doors; it cannot be hid; its value can be ascertained more clearly than anything else. Here is a piece of land on Fifth avenue. You go to a real estate broker, give him the location of it, and he will tell you pretty nearly its value; but he cannot tell you the value of the house without examination, and as to the value of what is inside the house, that is impossible. It may be filled with the most costly furniture and paintings, or it may be bare. Again, in the funds raised for purposes of common benefit, the people would have a direct interest, and public attention would be concentrated upon their collection and disbursement; and finally, something that you will not fully understand until you see clearly what enormous improvements in present social conditions this simple reform would work—poverty would be abolished; no one need be poor if he is willing to work, and in that condition of society the greed for wealth would also surely go. Men would become less grasping than they are to-day. It would be possible to get for public service the

best talent and the highest character. Society would be elevated—elevated from the very foundation, and the social conscience improved.

Q.—In the Captain Kidd illustration given by you, would not the same argument pertain equally to the possession of personal property which may have been unjustly obtained?

A.—No; as I say in that very illustration, the wrong done in the appropriation of personal property ceases with time. A horse is stolen, a watch is picked out of one's pocket, a ship is taken, and the injury soon ends; but when land is wrongfully appropriated it is not robbery taken from that generation, but the robbery rises on with all succeeding generations. Personal property tends to decay, and passes away in a very short time; none or two generations at the most it is gone; but the land remains forever. One generation after another will live on this land. Where will this building be one thousand years from now? But others will be living on this land.

Q.—In case people could hold land only as tenants, would not the tendency be to deterioration in all matters of improvement, especially in beautifying homes and in scientific and artistic farming?

A.—Possibly, if they were to hold land as tenants liable to be put out in a short time. But we don't propose the actual leasing of land by the state; we don't propose to make the holders of land formal tenants. We propose that land shall be held precisely as it is now, the only change being the increase of the tax on land values and the abolition of other taxes. The effect of this would be that no one would care to get hold of land that he did not wish to make use of, and the formal ownership of land, the real possession of it, would pass into the hands of those wishing to use it. Under this system a man would own his home just as securely, in fact far more securely, than he can now. The house would be his, the possession of the land would be his. He would still be its owner, subject to the condition of paying this tax, and could give it or sell it, just as he does now.

Q.—Inasmuch as the popular sentiment and the calm judgment of the people are opposed to the spending of our present surplus for the benefit of any part of the country or of any special interest, may we not infer that were the government the great landlord, it would be powerless to do anything with its land, except in the most economical and parsimonious way? And would not even this limited power open the flood-gates of political corruption?

A.—I think probably you have in your mind that the government will take the position of the owner of the land on whose shoulders rests the burden of improvement. This, as I have said, we do not propose. As for the surplus that remains in our national treasury, the real cause of its existence is the system under which we now raise our revenues. Everybody knows that we are raising too much; but when an attempt is made to repeal any of these taxes, up jump selfish interests to protest, log roll, and bribe, against the repeal of the tax which benefits them, though it injures the public at large. Sweep away that system, and you are rid of one great cause of corruption. But you should understand that we do not propose that the income from the taxation of land values should go to the general government, except in very small part. We have no necessity for much revenue for the general government. We have no need whatever for an army, a navy or a lot of ministers abroad; and very many of the present expenses of the general government would be largely reduced by the simpler system of raising revenue.

Q.—Do you not think that the best way to civilize the Indians is to confer upon them the private ownership of land?

A.—No, on the contrary; if you ask the Indians themselves they will tell you that this simply means destruction, extermination. Where the Indians can hold their lands in common, under the tribal system, as is the custom with all primitive peoples, there is among them no such thing as pauperism. The father may be a drunkard, but when the children come they have a chance to earn a living, an opportunity to make homes for themselves. Wherever the Indian lands have been divided up in severalty they have in a little while passed into the possession of speculators. I was talking recently with a gentleman who spent a number of years at Saginaw, Mich., and he told me the saddest stories of a tribe that was living on that peninsula. They were living in contentment in a simple state and still they all had enough. A lot of speculators got a bill through congress to divide up their lands in severalty, and the consequence was that in two years there were only fourteen who had any land left; the rest had become mere tramps.

Q.—Is there any greater wrong or any greater temptation to wrong in holding large quantities of land for a rise than in holding the products of land for a similar purpose?

A.—Certainly there is. The effect of speculation in land raises the price of corn, wheat, or anything of that kind; it increases the incentive for production; but you cannot produce land. The effect of speculation in land is to deprive people of the opportunity of producing other things. One might corner all the wheat in the world, and the effect would not last very long; but let one become the absolute owner of all the land in the world and what would become of the people? They could only live as his serfs.

Q.—Would the inability to own land have the tendency to equalize the ownership of wealth? Under such a dispensation should we not be just as likely to have Goulds and Vanderbilts as we are now?

A.—Inability to own land is hardly the way to put it. What we propose is to levy upon the land a tax equal to its annual value, irrespective of improvements upon it. This would strike at the heart of the great fortunes of the Goulds and the Vanderbilts. It would do this by making it unprofitable for any one to hold land which he did not want to put to use. The consequence of this would be that there would be no such thing as a class of men who could not find employment for themselves. There would be a demand for all possible labor. Then that intense competition that now drives down wages in all vocations would be gone, and in thus striking at the root of wealth, the power that a man gets by the possession of millions comes not so much from the fact that he has the millions as from the poverty of the people, who are glad to do anything to get only a few dollars of it. A man can have all the money he wants in a condition of things where everyone could find employment and get a good and independent living, and he could do no harm, further than these fortunes of which you speak. As for the fortunes that have come with the rise of the railroad systems, they have come because we have left in private hands a great public franchise. We have done what would have been equivalent in old times to making over the highways to individuals. Now, properly, the maintenance of highways is a public function, and this is just as true when those highways are of iron as when they are of cobblestones, or Macadam, or mere earth. The difficulty that stands in the way of our taking these franchises and managing them for the public benefit, is simply the corruption of the government. The simple plan that we propose of levying a single tax, leaving everything else free, would be to simplify our government so that we could take possession of these railways and even run the roads (or run cars over them) with far less danger of

demoralization than is involved in our present system of taxation. Our tariff is, to my mind, productive of far more corruption than the running of the railroads by government could possibly be.

Q.—Does not the "unearned increment" idea apply with as much force to personal property as to land?

A.—It does not. What is the kind of personal property that increases with the growth of society? Can you think of any? Here, take this house; it is not more valuable than it was when it was built. On the contrary, it is less valuable. It is nearer decay, and, further than that, the improvement in building has been such that a similar house could now be built for less cost. The building has not increased in value, but the ground on which it stands has. What other thing is there that increases with the growth of the community grows in value, save land? Land, always and everywhere, does, and it is the only thing. What John Stuart Mill called the "unearned increment" is this increase in value, unearned by the owner. The value of a piece of land is not what the individual owner has given to it; it is the value caused by the growth of the community. He may be asleep, or he may be off in Europe, or traveling around the world; this increase of value goes on all the same. It is a value created by the community, and it should belong to the community.

Q.—How about the accumulation of interest? Is not that equally an "unearned increment"?

A.—No; interest is the return for the use of capital, which is the product of labor used in further production. Interest does not increase with increase of population; it is interest here any higher than it was fifty years ago!

Q.—Under the present condition is there any unwholesome tendency to the acquisition or the possession of land?

A.—Unquestionably there is, if you mean by that is the possession of land concentrating? All over the United States, it is concentrating in obedience to a general law. As the land goes up in value it steadily tends to concentrate. If you take Macaulay's introduction to the "History of England," you will find it states that at the time of the accession of James I. the majority of English farmers were owners of their own land. At the beginning of this century there were so few of them owners of their own land that they had ceased to be considered. The great agency in producing this concentration was the rise in the value of land. Land, as I said before, lies out of doors. It cannot be stolen; it cannot run away. There it is, and there it will remain. For that reason, under the system of private ownership, land is the most secure investment, and the people who have large amounts of money are willing to pay for land—for the purpose of having a secure investment—more than it is worth to the owner of only a small amount of capital. For instance, the English farmer having a piece of land that would sell for £1,000 could not borrow what capital he wanted to use for less than six, seven or eight per cent; but he might sell his land and then get back its use by paying a rent of only three or four per cent on the selling price. Manifestly, therefore, it was to his interest to sell the land, and in the mutations that come of sickness, accident and losing speculation, he has gradually lost his capital, and of his successors some to-day are tenant farmers of the English capitalist type, and more are agricultural laborers of England—probably the most degraded race of men who speak the English language; men whose lives are spent in the hardest kind of work, and whose old age—if they live to be old—has no relief but in going to the almshouse.

Q.—Would not the placing of taxation wholly upon land work to the disadvantage of cultivators thereof and to the advantage of owners and managers of money and personal wealth?

A.—No, not at all. The taxation of capital does not affect the capitalist. It falls ultimately upon the user of the capital, and it gives, moreover, an advantage to those who are unscrupulous enough to take advantage in avoiding the taxation. But to raise our public revenues by a tax upon the value of land alone would exempt the producer and the consumer from taxation. It would be to the advantage of the man who is cultivating the soil, and of the man who is making the goods, and of the man who is selling the goods, and all that it produced from taxation direct and indirect than he would have to pay by reason of the increased tax on the value of his ground. He would be a great gainer.

Q.—Would not the doing away with the private ownership of land destroy one of the most sacred charms of home—the home feeling? This question is one which has seemed to trouble the minds of our young ladies.

A.—Well now, young ladies, look around you in this city. Here we have private ownership of land. What are its results? In this city not four per cent of the people live in separate homes of their own. Over sixty-five per cent of the families in this city are crowded together more than two families to the floor. There are thousands of families in this city living in single rooms. Do you call that home? Can there be a home in the condition in which the vast majority of the people of this city live? Look, then, to the country. What is the condition of the ordinary farmer's wife? Can anything be more dreary than that isolated existence? People are scattered so far apart that they have none of the conveniences and intellectual enjoyments of neighborhood. It is a most significant fact that insanity is rapidly increasing in this country, and it is nowhere increasing more rapidly than among farmers' wives. Now, if we had the form we propose would be that, no one having any incentive to hold land idle, the population in our cities would spread, while in the country it would come closer together. One-half of the area in this city is yet unbuild upon—simply lying in vacant lots—not because people do not want homes, but because there is not capital and labor sufficient to cover these vacant lots, but because the owners of the land are holding it at enormous prices, trusting to the increase of population to give them profit. And the isolation of country life is caused by the same thing. Men when they take up land do not take up what they want to use; they grab all they can get, and so you have a population unduly crowded at the centers and thinly separated at the outskirts. Under the system that we propose it would be profitable for no one to hold land that was not put into use. Population in our cities would spread out, and we would get even in our greatest cities populations living in separate homes surrounded by gardens, and in the country, instead of the present isolation, people would settle closer together, so that they would have opportunities for social enjoyment, and intellectual life. So far from destroying homes, the system we advocate would make it easy for every one to get a home. What to-day stands in the way of a man getting a home? The big thing is the price he has to pay for the lot on which a house is to be put. Then comes the tax gatherer and flies him for having built himself a house. Under our system he could get his land for nothing, and he would have little or no tax to pay. Now, which system is the best in that respect?

It was here proposed that Mr. George briefly state his scheme so that it might be understood. Mr. Packard remarking that, although the young men and young women had been diligently pondering over "Progress and

Poverty," "Social Problems" and "Property in the Future," nobody seemed quite to understand the "George theory."

Mr. George—I am afraid that is because you have read rather what the newspapers say of my books than the books themselves. However, I set out with the proposition that land—that is to say, the material universe, because it is only through land and by land that we can use any part of the material universe—is something that belongs in usufruct to all men and women equally and of natural right, while the things produced by human labor belong exclusively to the producers. Now to secure that common right of all in the land in conformity with the individual right of the producer to the things he produces, so that all may have access on equal terms to the element necessary to life and labor, and all may have the fullest possession of that which their labor of hand or of head adds to the common wealth, what we propose is this: To let the present legal title to the land remain as it is, and to simply abolish all taxes upon production or upon accumulation—not to tax any man for building a house, for making a piece of goods, or for erecting a factory, or for bringing into the country any wealth from abroad; not to tax him because he accumulates wealth, no matter how much he accumulates; but, abolishing these taxes, to raise our public revenues by a tax levied on the value of the land, irrespective of improvements, and raising this tax as fast as we may, until we come as near as possible to taking the full, actual value of the land, thus giving to the community that fund which arises from the development of the community and grows with its growth, and leaving to the individual all that his industry or thrift gives him.

That is our scheme. It is very simple, it involves no revolution, it will not add to the functions of the state. All we have to do to carry it out is to abolish taxes. We now put some tax upon land values. By increasing this tax we can dispense with other taxes, taking more and more of the annual value of land, until finally we take the whole. We would thus get not merely enough to pay our present expenses, but a very much more. We would have a great public fund to be used for public recreation, education and amusement; that could be used to give us clean streets, fine walks and splendid parks; for purposes of scientific investigation, etc., and finally, could be used—as I believe a portion ought to be used—for taking care of the widow and orphan; not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of right. Everyone in a civilized community like this is co-heir to a great estate. Here is an enormous value constantly growing, produced by no individual, but by the growth of the community, that should be used for the common benefit. This is what we propose, and the gains that we look for result, first, from the simplification of our present form of taxation; second, from the exemption of the results of labor from taxation; third, from the utilization for public purposes of what is now supposed to be unjustly gathered by individuals, and, fourth, from the opening of land, now monopolized, to the use of labor.

Q.—(From a young lady)—Do you think that fund could ever be used equitably for the people so long as God has made them so unequal—some born with evil hearts and grasping dispositions, some unscrupulous, some honest, some intelligent and shrewd, and, in short, so long as God sees fit to create them so widely different, can we set them on an equality by any plan that can be devised?

A.—I do not think God creates people as unequal as our conditions make them, either mentally or morally. I do not think God makes them so wicked as bad conditions lead them to be. I do not think the human heart is altogether evil. On the contrary, my estimate is that most men are inclined to be just and generous; that they become hard, greedy, grasping and unscrupulous by reason of the fierce struggle for existence in which they are engaged. The motto of our society to-day is in reality, "Devil take the hindmost"—either crush others or be crushed yourself; and the thing that we really worship is not the living God, but the golden calf. Let man get wealth by whatever means he pleases, let him get wealth, and he will be honored, and will have all that, to the eye at least, makes life worth having. Abolish poverty, give us the state of society in which every child that comes into the world could at least have wholesome surroundings, could have some good education, could at least have an opportunity of making a good living, and I think the temptation to greed would be gone. Under a condition like that we could not admire wealth as we do now. We admire wealth because we fear poverty. Under that state of things I do not think we would have an immoral class or a pauper class. I do not think that men would be as bad as they are to-day, and that all the influences and good motives that animate men would have a much stronger sway.

There are, as you say, differences among men; but the great differences of which you speak are owing mainly to human institutions. There are children coming into the world in this city every day who come in absolutely disinherited, who come in amid squalid surroundings, and whose condition in the healthy development is absolutely impossible—many of them under conditions which drive them out of the world within a few months or years. We can certainly change this state of things; and then whatever differences there are among men—differences of industry, of prudence, of capability, let them have their sway and produce their natural result. Let him who works hardest get his natural reward. Under our present condition of things the man who grabs best, or whose ancestors grab for him, is the successful man.

No; I do not think the present evils of society result from the wickedness of the human heart, except as that wickedness may take shape in social institutions which give scope to greed, and then react upon the characters of men; but we can conform our institutions and laws to promote right and justice, we will be doing away with that tendency.

Q.—(Student)—Would it be just for the owner of a plot of ground with only a small building of two stories, say, to pay as much tax on the land as his neighbor on the opposite corner who owns a similar piece of land, but has a fine six-story five-prob building on his property? Would that be fair for the poor man? He would be taxed just as much as the rich man.

A.—If I go up here to the Fifth Avenue hotel and order a room, they will charge me just the same whether I am a big man or a little man, whether I am rich or poor. Just the same whether I make use of it or not. And the reason is that I am taking that room and keeping somebody else out of it. If one man has little buildings it is not the fault of the community. He is holding the ground on which he might put big buildings. We give him the opportunity; if he does not put up big buildings it is his own fault.

This is the true system of taxation. It is not what the man himself does, but the opportunity that the community gives him that ought to be considered, and if the opportunities are equal, taxation ought to be equal.

Q.—(Student)—Do they charge as much for a little room as for a big one?

A.—No; nor should we charge as much for a little lot as for a big one.

Q.—(Student)—Does not England dictate to the landlords their prices?

A.—Yes; and the people who are support-

ing that sort of thing are supporting the grossest sort of communism.

Q.—(Young lady student)—Why do we need no army or navy?

A.—We have no use for an army or navy because we are sixty millions of people, the richest, the brightest, the most inventive, and therefore the strongest of any nation upon earth, living upon a continent separated by three thousand miles of water from all the wars and quarrels of Europe. We are so strong that nobody on the earth would dare to pick a quarrel with us. We ought to be so just and so righteous that we would pick a quarrel with nobody; and we no more want an army or navy than John L. Sullivan would want a stuffed club in walking down Broadway.

Q.—(Same)—Although so strong, we once were weak enough to quarrel with ourselves.

Mr. George—I hope we never shall quarrel with ourselves again; but this is certain, that our preparations for war, our army and navy that we had before the war did not do much toward putting it down or making it impossible; and to maintain an army and navy would not make internal quarrels any more improbable, but on the contrary, might be an inducement to quarrel. A man and his wife sometimes quarrel, but it would be a dangerous thing for them to keep weapons at hand in case they might quarrel.

Q.—(Student)—How would a poor man get money to put a building on a piece of land?

A.—Supposing he could not get it he could have this advantage, that he could get buildings that other men put upon land much cheaper than he can now. To make monopolization—the holding of land without using it—impossible would be to make land cheap for the putting up of buildings, and to take the taxes off buildings would be to increase by that much the inducement to put them up. Therefore, men who have money would go to work and put up buildings on what are now vacant lots. It would increase the number of buildings, and the man who must rent a building could get it by paying less rent than he does to-day.

Q.—(Student)—With no army, what protection would you have against mobs?

A.—I think we could rely upon our militia to put down all mobs; but wherever there is a mob you will find that there is some injustice. The best way to prevent mobs is to do justice.

Q.—(Student)—In 1886, during the great labor strikes, the employees of a factory in Chicago were urged to strike by a man who it was afterward found had never worked in his life.

A.—You must not believe all you read in the newspapers. I think that story is not quite correct, and even if it were correct there is underneath some real basis of complaint. Do away with that and you will have no difficulty.

Q.—(Student)—To abolish poverty and to give the poor people money we must take it out of the rich man's pockets, and he would not like that very well.

Mr. George—Where does the rich man get his money?

Student—That has nothing to do with the man who hasn't any.

Mr. George—It has everything to do with it. If the rich man got their wealth by making it, by giving something fairly in return, then all right. We do not propose to take it from them. But if they do not, then it must come from somebody who does work to produce it, and the wealth they have is really the robbery of the poor. This we aim to stop. It is utterly impossible for any man to fairly get the monstrous fortunes that some have in this community. What we want to do is to give men a fair opportunity. Under the present system thousands and thousands of men must constantly pay other men for the privilege of living and working—must pay somebody else for the privilege of using that which was created for their use. Abolish that system; do away with this primary injustice, and then all men will have equal opportunities and you can secure to those who produce wealth the full enjoyment of it.

Q.—Did not all land once belong to the government?

A.—Yes; but, supposing somebody's forefather had had the foresight to lay claim to property in the sun, and were to leave his children the right of charging other people's children for the enjoyment of the light of the sun, would that be reason why other people's children should be such fools as to keep on paying it? What right had Adam and Eve to give away this world? When they died and went to some other world they certainly lost all right in this. And what right has any one since then had? All the generations of the world have had no right to give any one perpetual title to the use of the earth. Every child that is born is born with a natural right to the use of land—a right that nothing can bar.

Q.—(Student)—You say the government is not corrupt, but the men who go into the government are corrupt, is it?

A.—No, I did not say that. I said that our laws of the present day, and especially our laws for raising revenue, foster corruption and put a premium upon fraud, and that they tend to make the government corrupt.

Q.—(Student)—Would not your plan make the people slaves to the government?

A.—No; but even if that were true, the American people had better be serfs to a government which means but themselves than to be serfs to private individuals. The great mass of American people are fast passing into the condition of serfdom. What is the essential thing in serfdom? It is that you must give your labor and ask no return. The majority of children that are born to-day must give their labor for the privilege of living and working in their native land, for the privilege of breathing the air or using the sunshine.

Q.—(Student)—Suppose a man owns a house and lot worth, say, \$15,000. If it is all he has. From the rent of that house he lives. Would you have the government take it from him without an equivalent, and thus destroy his only income?

A.—I would let things remain as they are now, the only difference being that I would take taxation off from the personal property and improvements and put it on the value of land. The man who now has a \$15,000 house which he rents would continue to rent it and receive the rent as he does now. The only difference would be that he would have to pay to the community a higher tax upon the value of his land, and no tax upon the value of his house. The relation between him and the tenant, however, would have the advantage in this, that the tendency being to erect more houses the tenant's rent would fall.

Q.—(Young lady student)—Is not the ocean as well as the land the gift of the Creator? Should not the people who use the ocean pay taxes?

A.—Yes; if that use is exclusive. Wherever the use of any part of the ocean becomes a valuable privilege, then the best way would be to have the user pay a tax; as, for instance, on the valuable fur fisheries in the Aleutian islands a tax is paid to the general government.

Q.—(Young lady)—Ought not the people who have refrigerators to pay taxes on the air they use?

A.—Wherever, if you can imagine such a case, the use of air is necessarily exclusive; but in that case the valuable privilege would give value to land. If you had some piece of land where the air was peculiarly good, that

piece of land would have a value resulting from the opportunity to get good air, and that value ought to be taken for the public.

Q.—(Young lady)—You say that land can not be produced. How about the Netherlands?

Mr. George—Tell me how the Netherlands were produced.

Young lady—They were wholly reclaimed by human labor.

Mr. George—What kind of labor?

Young lady—By draining, and diking, and digging trenches and canals.

Mr. George—Where did they build the dikes?

Young lady—Partly in the sea, and then filled with earth and reclaimed the bottom of the sea.

Mr. George—What would they have done if there had been no bottom there? The improvement is the result of human labor, and that is something for which no one ought to be taxed, for at least a specified time. But what was the bottom before it was filled up?

Young lady—It was presumably land.

Mr. George—Yes; and if any value attached to that it ought to be taxed. Land doesn't mean simply the surface of the earth which you see. It is all land in the economic sense, down to the center. You have got to have some foundation before you can improve. The ocean has value in only specified places, where some exclusive advantage is attached to its use, as in pearl fisheries or in an oyster bed. Land, as I said in the beginning, has no intrinsic value. All the land on the continent of America was worth nothing before men came here.

Q.—(Student)—How do you account for all the land destroyed by human labor, etc.?

A.—You cannot destroy land; even where you wash the soil away, land remains.

And now, young ladies and gentlemen, I find that my time has more than elapsed, and I must conclude. I have been greatly pleased with your questions and have answered them as well as I could so briefly. I fully agree with Mr. Packard that the only way to get knowledge is to get it for yourselves. You will, indeed, remember very little of all I have said, but it may induce you to think and read, and out of that I hope some good may come.

The Crusaders' Song.

(Air—"Marching Through Georgia.")

"Egypt" in the Catholic Herald.

Sound a blast for freedom, boys, and send it far and wide!

March along to victory; for God is on our side!

While the voice of Nature thunders o'er the rising tide,

"God made the land for the people!"

CHORUS.

The land! The land! 'Twas God who gave the land!

The land! The land! The ground whereon we stand!

Why should we be beggars, with the ballot in our hand?

God gave the land for the people!

Hark! The shout is swelling, from the east and from the west;

Why should we beg work and let the landlords take the best?

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
25 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1887.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Friday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

DEACON S. V. WHITE of Brooklyn and Wall street recently made a speech at Galesburg, O., in which, after boasting of the immense opportunities offered to industry and enterprise in this country, he referred to the fact that he himself began his business career thirty-five years ago by sawing wood in Galesburg at seventy-five cents a day, the necessary inference being that any American who begins life by sawing wood, or performing other manual labor, may, by diligence and thrift, come to be as rich as Deacon White is, within thirty-five years.

The same New York paper which reports the deacon's speech informs us that the drivers and conductors of a street railway chiefly owned by Mr. White are complaining to district assembly 75, K. of L., that they are allowed only half an hour for dinner, instead of an hour, and that there is no regularity in their trips.

The connection which Deacon White endeavored to establish in the minds of the people of Galesburg between sawing wood at seventy-five cents a day and becoming a millionaire within thirty-five years is somewhat difficult. The connection between the unpaid daily performance of half an hour's extra work by some hundreds or thousands of men, and the rapid increase of the wealth of the man for whom they work, is decidedly obvious.

The pro-poverty economists and papers tell us that in thus demanding a daily extra half hour's work from every one of his drivers and conductors, Deacon White is acting strictly within his rights; he offers his employees a certain wage for a certain amount of work; if they don't feel satisfied with it, let them leave the job and go elsewhere. Then one of two things will happen—either men will come forward who will be satisfied to work for Deacon White on Deacon White's own terms, or the deacon, finding it impossible to secure men for the wages he offers, will be compelled to accede to his present employees' demands. In either case, the matter will have been settled without friction, and in strict accordance with the laws of trade. There is an appearance of straightforwardness and simplicity about such a statement of the case that is very captivating—to people who don't take the trouble to think.

"This," says Deacon White to his conductors and drivers, "is my railroad. If you don't choose to work on it on my terms, leave it! If you want to dictate the terms on which a railroad shall be run, go get a railroad of your own!"

All right. Suppose they do it. Let us fancy that the conductors and drivers, taking the deacon at his word, and favored by extraordinary good luck, hunt around until they find people willing to let them have the use of sleepers and iron and cars and horses—the whole equipment of a railroad, in short. Still something is lacking—the most essential thing of all. Before they can lay or operate their road, they must get something more, which Deacon White has, and which they haven't—the franchise—the privilege of using the streets. Without that, ties and iron and cars and horses and their own brawn and muscle are useless to them; their condition is practically unchanged; they must still accept the deacon's offered terms or remain idle.

"This is ridiculous," says the pro-poverty advocate. "There are plenty of occupations besides railroad; let these discontented fellows select some other vocation for which no franchise is needed, and go to work at that." And where, pray, are these vocations to be found? Mr. Maloney, the car driver, could make an excellent living by crossing the river to the Jersey shore and breaking the solid rock of the Palisades up into paving blocks. There is plenty of demand for these blocks; there are millions of tons of rock to split them out of; a hammer, a drill and a pound or two of gunpowder are all the capital required for the business. But let Mr. Maloney go to work on the Palisade rocks, and straightway some fellow will appear with his little franchise paper, duly signed, sealed and delivered, confounding Maloney's impudence, and vigorously explaining that he doesn't want paving blocks split out of that rock just now, and when he does, he'll hire a man to do it at suitable wages.

Is Mr. Maloney an agriculturist? There are thousands of acres of arable land close at hand, untilled and vacant; but for every acre some individual possesses a written franchise, such as Deacon White holds for his railroad. Is he a house builder? Be-

fore he can go to work appears some franchise holder from whom permission to build must be bought. Soil, rock, mineral, over each and all of them stand people waving franchise papers, forbidding any man to go to work unless he gives them so much out of what he makes, and contemptuously bidding him, if he doesn't like the terms they offer, to go elsewhere.

In the light of these facts, Deacon White's fair-seeming suggestion to his employees to go look for work somewhere else if they don't like his hours or his pay is something of a mockery. And the methods by which, within the space of thirty-five years, a man can develop from a wood sawer at seventy-five cents a day to a several-times millionaire are pretty evident. An immense and steadily increasing mass of humanity is urged to labor by the pressing need of food and shelter; a small body of men hold franchises which enable them to say whether other men shall go to work or not. Manifestly, the sure way to wealth is, not to work, but to become a franchise holder and sell the privilege of working to others. And this is what Deacon White and other millionaires have done. What the good man meant to say in his Galesburg speech was, not that the way to get rich is to saw wood at seventy-five cents a day, which is absurd, but that a man may begin life by working at seventy-five cents a day and get rich nevertheless, provided he is cunning enough, and unscrupulous enough, and lucky enough to get possession of a sufficient quantity of franchises to make an army of men work for him.

In a blind, unconscious, groping sort of a way these facts are recognized by our law makers and administrators. Only the other day there arrived in this port of New York fifteen Irish families—ninety-three souls in all—from Killarney, in Ireland, against whom the heinous charge was made that they had no money wherewith to buy permission to go to work. The grown persons among them were stout, able-bodied and healthy, and of good moral character—the same sort of people exactly as were the ancestors of the best and most aristocratic families of New York and other of our cities; but they brought with them nothing but a willingness to work, and—and—in fact, all the work franchises have been gobbled by the best families aforesaid, and there are no more left. And so free America sought to bang the door in the face of oppressed Ireland, and but for a judicially discovered "defect" in the law would have sent the fools who had fled hither to be rid of landlordism back to Killarney, bidding them put money in their purses before they came again.

It was a cruel thing to try to do, but strictly logical. It rather takes the point off our Fourth of July oratory to be sending the oppressed of Ireland back to Ireland and refusing them an asylum here, but really it's the very least we can do, in justice to Mr. Maloney, the car driver, and his fellows. For if we insist that Mr. Maloney and the rest of the people already here shall compete, each with all the rest, to see who will give most to the holders of franchises in return for the privilege of working for a living, it would be a manifest injustice to make the competition keener by introducing fresh competitors.

There is an alternative, of course—there always is. We might tell Deacon White and the other franchise owners that God evidently provided this earth for the use of the people living in it, and that if they want to control the franchises of car running, and stone cutting, and grain raising, and coal mining, and so forth, to the exclusion of Mr. Maloney and his fellows, they must be content to pay for them whatever they may be worth. Such a system would very soon throw the work franchise open, not only to Deacon White's car drivers and conductors and all the rest of the plundered poor of these United States, but also to as many Killarney families as might choose to immigrate; or, for that matter, to the whole population of Europe if they came here in a body.

But then it wouldn't be possible for a man to begin life by sawing wood at seventy-five cents a day and become a double or treble millionaire within thirty-five years.

It is said that the various manufacturers and importers of india rubber have decided to pool their interests in one grand combination, to be known as the "rubber trust"; and, whether the report be true or not, it is interesting as illustrating one of the strongest tendencies of the modern industrial system—that toward combination and consolidation. The small producers are swallowed up by the larger; the large producers are combined into corporations; and these in turn are aggregated into pools or syndicates or trusts, in such a way as to render competition among producers not only needless and unprofitable, but absolutely impossible. By acting together in this way the coal mine owners settle month by month what shall be the people's allowance of coal, and what price the people shall pay for it; the railway monarchs impose upon commerce such rates as it can bear; the Standard oil trust prevents competition among the refiners; the phosphate rock syndicate regulates the phosphate mining of South Carolina; the cotton seed oil trust rules the market of the whole United States, and the rubber trust will fix the price of its raw material, regulate the manufacture of rubber products, and determine, with mathematical certainty, the highest rate of profit that can be exacted without unduly checking consumption.

Thus the march of concentration goes on, in obedience to the law of social evolution; tending more and more to abolish

that competition which is said to be the life of trade, while enforcing and rendering keener the competition for employment among the great mass of the people who have only brain and muscle to offer in exchange for the necessities of life. That these combinations are well nigh irresistible engines of oppression is a truth which even the pro-poverty press and preachers are forced to recognize. What is less generally understood is that their power of oppression is mainly due to the counter pressure against their victims of the unyielding wall of landlordism. Between the syndicate which will give him work only upon its own terms and the land monopolist who either absolutely refuses him permission to work, or grants it on terms still more oppressive, the laborer is rapidly being squeezed to the limit of his endurance. The situation is becoming plainer every day to whomsoever, having eyes, will see. It is fortunate for our civilization that as the evil becomes more apparent the remedy also grows more evident. When once the equal right of access to the general bounties of nature shall have been restored to men by the absorption of land values in taxation, if these giant combinations are not transformed from instruments of oppression to beneficent agents of production, the way to deal with them will at least have been made clearer.

The labor party is petitioning the pope to reinstate McGlynn and denounces O'Brien because he refuses to advocate the theory that the Irish should steal their landlords' property. —[Mail and Express.]

Two deliberate falsehoods. The labor party has never thought of petitioning the pope or any other foreign prince, and it denounces William O'Brien, not because he refuses to advocate the theory that the Irish should steal their landlords' property, but because he persists in advocating the theory that the landlords should only steal seventy-five per cent of their tenants' property.

A CORRESPONDENT calls attention to the fact that a sale of land is mentioned in the Bible before that by which the people of Egypt delivered up their lands and their bodies to Pharaoh to gain relief from famine. This is true, though the sale was not one such as we would even at this day call a real estate transaction. It was merely the purchase of a burial lot. Sarah being dead, Abraham begged of the children of Heth that they would give him possession of a burial place, and Ephron sold him the field in which was situated the cave of Machpelah for the purpose. This certainly indicates that private ownership in land was known to the Hittites, or children of Heth, but it must be remembered that the Hittites were a Hamite race, neither of the country nor kindred of Abraham or Isaac, and that the Old Testament does not represent them as enjoying the favor and guidance of God. THE STANDARD, therefore, appears to have been right in showing that the first real estate operation, as we understand the term, was that which delivered the Egyptians into slavery, and that the direct command of God to the chosen people forbade to them the system of ownership in anything more than the mere right to the use of land.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

The Tariff and the Land Value Tax.

NEWBURYPORT.—I wish to inquire whether or not your system of taxing land values could be applied, and yet maintain a protective tariff. Having read your "Protection, or Free Trade?" I am convinced that by the abolishment of our protective tariff our burdens would be greatly diminished. But there are many who, although they believe that land values, and not improvements, should be taxed, are as yet unwilling to abolish the system of raising revenues by an indirect taxation.

A. R. CURTIS.

The system of taxing land values alone could not be fully applied without abolishing both revenue and protective tariffs. All who understand the land value tax and appreciate its far-reaching effects in setting labor free are not only willing, but anxious to abolish our system of raising revenue by indirect taxation. Those people to whom you refer as believing "that land values and not improvements should be taxed," and who also favor indirect taxation, have other reasons than conviction for approving the land value tax. They, unlike yourself, have not read "Protection or Free Trade."

Substantially Correct.

NEW YORK, June 8.—I have submitted the following paragraph to a friend of mine, who, upon reading it, declares that I am wrong in my statement. Will you please state whether my statement is true or not:

"Land value is an intangible value which can only be created by the aggregation of population, in the creation of which one member of a community contributes as much as another—his presence. Indeed, in many cases, the land owner does not even do so much."

CHARLES H. MITCHELL.

Your statement, so far as it relates to real estate distinguished from speculative land values, is perfectly correct, except that improvements in the arts, government, manners, morals, and so on, also create land values. Your idea, evidently is that it is only demand for land that creates land values, and that landlords contribute no more than the rest of the community, and in this you are right. The only way in which landlords specially contribute to land values is by cornering land, and thus giving it a speculative value; in doing that they are not entitled to the gratitude of other people, nor would they do it, except in expectation of future demand for use. Your use of the adjective, "intangible," is unnecessary.

Which?

NEW YORK, June 10.—An esteemed friend of mine has purchased a house and lot, which cost him \$13,500, on which he has paid \$2,000 in cash, and the balance is secured by a mortgage at five per cent per annum. Supposing that through legislation a single tax becomes an accomplished fact, how would he be affected by it? And what would prevent the

holder of the mortgage from foreclosing in consequence of the fall in land values?

BENJAMIN VAN VEEK.

The single tax would make such a change in the industrial conditions that it is impossible to say exactly how your friend would be affected. His land value would fall, while the interest and principal on his mortgage would not. If he took advantage of the improved business condition, he would make enough more than, as an average business man, he makes now, to enable him to keep down the interest and pay off the principal with greater ease than he can now. If he did not take advantage of that improved condition, but relied solely on the land and house for his income, he would be foreclosed. That this would be an injustice to him so far as it affected his interest in the house is undisputed; but his wrong would be temporary, while the greater wrong which the land value tax would remove is perpetual. Which shall we choose?

A Lapsus Calami.

LYNN, Mass., June 14.—In the last STANDARD is a bad misprint in an article on the effect of a tax on land. It says, I believe, that whatever tends to increase the supply of anything tends to increase the price. Should like to see it corrected this week.

T. P. PERKINS.

It was a slip of the pen and should read, "Whatever tends to increase the supply of anything tends to decrease the price."

Land Grabbing in Henry VIII's Time.

OSWEGO, N. Y.—The present immoral theories of private ownership of land are comparatively modern and were allowed to grow and assert themselves after the causes of the feudal tenures had ceased to exist, but at various times they were opposed even by laws. The 13th of the 25th of Henry VIII, after reciting the fact that greedy and covetous persons had accumulated a vast multitude of farms and had kept them in their hands to the exclusion of husbandmen, thus driving them to robbery and theft or to cold and hunger, enacted that no person should hold or own more than two farms, and even restricted the owners in the manner of use of such farms. The act was aimed at the merchants of London, who were becoming large land owners and were pleased to think that they could use their lands in the same manner as their goods and merchandise. The change of the tenure of land and the doctrine of its private ownership gradually drove the small land owners into the ranks of the agricultural laborers until the present land monopoly was reached.

The statesmen of early times were charmed to see the small land owners disappear. They held that the possession of a small estate tended to make its owner revolutionary and democratic, while, on the other hand, the great landlords would be interested in maintaining present institutions—that the land would be better cultivated, and thus the nation would become richer and more prosperous. Even the great Bacon lamented the law against inclosing the commons, holding that it was a blow at the prosperity of the nation. He evidently considered the wealth of a few individuals or of a class the index of the prosperity of the whole people. Our able statesmen make the same great mistake.

The vast amount of unoccupied land in this country has made us as indifferent to the immorality of the present system of land tenure as the English of those days were to its gradual appearance. They also had land enough and to spare, and would have thought the present condition of the people of England impossible.

C. N. MATSON.

Owners of Lands and Lives.

CHIHUAHUA, Mexico, June 1.—Your doctrines have been my day dreams for years. I have been a soldier asleep on his arms for lack of a leader. Your books are trumpet calls to battle. Among my friends are many Mexicans who share our views. To the few who read English I lend your books, and to those who cannot I talk about the subject, which we have dubbed "Dueños de tierras y vidas," viz., "Owners of lands and lives." There are millions of acres in private hands here, where the miserable "peons" sons inherit nothing but a right to slave and pay the debts of their fathers. The hopelessness of it all is that these people are as content as swine when hunger is satisfied, and when not, they are patient, very patient, and die easily. Even now the municipal lands set apart for each town and village are passing from the possession of the people; even their "burros" can no longer graze on the common lands at liberty lest they should encroach on the rich neighbors' corn fields. This land is owned by the township and the rents go to the town, but the rich men of the town fix the rents, so that the workers gain little or no advantage. Truth is our beacon.

N. D. ALMA.

Truth Told in a College Oration.

B. J. Hazen of Middlebury, Vt., in a college oration recently, said: "Let us consider for a moment what would be the result if one, shrewder than his fellows, should put an invisible barrier of ownership about the fishing ground, saying: 'This is mine. You can not go there except upon my terms.' The men who wished to fish there would no longer have the whole product of their labor, but would be compelled to hand over whatever proportion of their earnings the owner chose to take. There is no difference in the last result whether a man owns the labor of other men or whether he owns the land upon which those men must live. In either case the proprietor grows rich by appropriating the products of the toil of others."

Dr. McGlynn as an Orator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 1.—I had the great pleasure of hearing Dr. McGlynn here, and regret that I could not form his acquaintance. I have rarely heard his equal as an orator, and I have heard Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Phillips and others. At the same time I more cordially responded to everything he said than to any speech I ever heard. After seeing and hearing him I can understand how it is that he holds his old flock, in spite of his church authorities, spell bound. God bless and preserve him, and speed the good cause!

DAVID R. GOOLDS.

A Path Marked by the Footprints of the Savior.

RAHWAY, N. J., June 14.—It is the promise which Dr. McGlynn gives to the religious aspect of this grand reform that arms him with power. It heretofore has been the weakness of social reformers that they have ignored (to a great extent) the Gospel. It is this which makes socialism and communism so utterly powerless to influence the American mind, and it is because the "new crusade" emblazons the cross (symbol of the teaching, suffering Christ) on its standard—for that and alone—I have enrolled myself among its defenders. To me, a pledged minister of the gospel, Jesus Christ is first, last and everything; and He is so because I find in Him all truth. Himself the "Good Samaritan" of His

own parable. He came to bind up the wounds of suffering humanity, to pour on them the soothing oil and to wash them with the healing wine. To follow Him in this is to do what that "priest of the people" and you are aiming to accomplish, and I go with you, whom I have never seen and may never see, because, and only because, I see the path to have long before been marked by the footprints of my Lord. Fealty to Christ demands it.

(REV.) WILLIAM ROLLINSON.

Mr. O'Brien Evicted a Great Principle.

CHICAGO, June 12.—I am delighted with the manner in which you handle William O'Brien in your issue of the 11th. Without being an Irishman or a Catholic, I have seen the "Irish issues" deftly manipulated and mixed up with American "issues," lo! these many years! And now comes this Mr. O'Brien and fears the intrusion of American "issues" upon the holy cause of collecting money for the Irish parliamentary party from the Hoffman house genus of the saviors of American society.

Possibly the practical question with Mr. O'Brien was \$25,000 without consistency, or else consistency without \$25,000; he chose the former with tears trickling down his cheek for the poor, oppressed, evicted tenants of Lansdowne, while he himself was evicting the reform principle from his own heart.

AUGUST E. GANX.

Bulletin Boards as Missionaries.

EAST SAGINAW, Mich., May 30.—Let me suggest that a good way to "spread the light" would be by use of the bulletin board. On this could be pasted an extract from some article on an industrial topic, one of those short, sharp and decisive arguments so often found in THE STANDARD, for instance. These bills could be printed in one place at small cost, in large, bold type, and the locals of the Knights of Labor, labor unions, granges, brotherhoods or any other societies or organizations might hang out a board either before their rooms or in some prominent place, and in this simple way supply information to great numbers of people.

J. SISSON.

An Edifice of Liberty.

BROOKLYN, June 9.—Of Irish descent, I was born, bred, and have ever been a strict Roman Catholic, believing that to be the one true church. But I always believe that Americans will never tolerate foreign dictation in our political affairs, for that determination is in-born in them, and those who become citizens soon imbibe the same feeling. Father McGlynn and you are laying the foundations of an edifice of liberty that will never crumble, and are sowing seeds that will yield good fruit, lifting men up and not dragging them down and disgracing them. All hail, and God-speed to you both, and to your heaven born cause.

PATRICK O. MALONEY.

Didn't Know How to Grind His Ax.

DETROIT, Mich., June 6.—If landlordism is wrong in Ireland, it must be wrong the world over, and I don't see how Editor O'Brien, with all his metaphysical skill, is to get out of that box. Given a principle that is wrong in one place, it must assuredly be wrong altogether. What is sauce for the goose will do just as well for the gander. Mr. O'Brien had an ax to grind, and at the last moment he inadvertently let the edge fall on the grindstone, and so undid in a moment all his labor. Who have been supporting the Irish land league? Is it not the people? Certainly not the moneyed interests, excepting at election times.

J. F. DUNGAN.

A Great Day for Cincinnati.

The Henry George club of Cincinnati is completing arrangements for a rousing celebration of the Fourth of July. It has engaged the Zoological garden, which comprises sixty-five acres of woodland, lake and pleasant walks, and in addition to the usual entertaining features of music and games, there will be elaborate exercises peculiar to the day. Addresses will be delivered by Joseph R. Buchanan of Chicago, Warren W. Bailey, editor of the Vincennes, Iowa, News, and Henry George. Arrangements have been made for excursions from all parts of Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky. It is expected that many thousands will attend.

An Eight-Year-Old Anti-Poverty Tract.

Will you please send me some tracts? I go to school every day, but I can give them out after I come home. My mamma and papa belong to the Anti-poverty society and I will join too, when I get money enough, if they will take a boy eight years old. I get all the tracts I can find when I go to the Academy of Music Sunday nights, but I only get a few. We all love Dr. McGlynn, but we are not Catholics. I will do all I can to help the cause along. I like Henry George, too, and I want to be like Dr. McGlynn when I get older. Please send the tracts to my mamma, Mrs. Burroughs.

HARRY F. BURROUGHS.

Want to Know the Reason, Why?

NEW YORK, May 25.—A former democrat, I am now a staunch advocate of your system of taxation, no matter who says it is wrong. The pope and others say it is wrong, but we all ask why? It is wrong! And these people answer, "Because it's wrong!" Now, this may be very convincing argument to their followers, but so far as the masses of us are concerned, more substantial reasons will have to be given. Call the party that seeks the amelioration of the condition of the working people by whatever name you please, and I am a member of it.

A. C. DEGOUR.

The Free Soil Club's Lecture.

The first lecture of a course given under the auspices of the Free soil club was delivered on Wednesday evening last by Hon. Thomas G. Shearman, at the Cooper union, the subject being "Taxation." That the subject was treated in a masterly style need hardly be told those who read the gentleman's paper on "The Single Tax" recently published in this paper. Rev. Charles P. McCarthy and Henry George addressed the audience briefly, Mr. George extending to Mr. Shearman an invitation to repeat his lecture before the Anti-poverty society.

"Please Bite on This File."

NEW YORK, June 9.—Shame on the writer of such stuff as that which appeared in the New York Herald (which so bitterly opposed and ridiculed Parnell and Davitt in their early struggles) under the head of "Please Bite on This File." It is an insult to Irishmen supposing that they are not competent to understand the false light in which he tries to place Henry George, whose noble doctrine is "the land for all the Irish," the laborer as well as the tenant farmer. Irishmen do not eat hay. They want no rights for themselves which they are not willing to concede to others.

J. T. C.

A Bright Young Paper.

The Milwaukee, Wis., Review is a young, handsome, union, daily paper, that advocates the abolition of all taxes, save one on land values. It is doing important work in starting a great many people in and around Milwaukee thinking.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Mrs. J. Hood Wright gave a garden party at Fort Washington lately. Among the attractions was a Punch and Judy show for the children, with a plentiful supply of strawberries and cream.

Katie Ludwig, aged 16, Carrie Pohl, aged 14, and Annie Ludwig, aged 15, used the Castle brand company of 103 and 105 Thompson street, New York, for wages due. It appeared in evidence that all three girls were experienced hands, the elder having been at work for three years and the two younger for six and seven months respectively. Their wages were \$3 a week, and their hours of labor ten daily. Judgment was given for the plaintiffs.

The Standard oil trust has a capital of over \$100,000,000, the Cotton oil trust of \$30,000,000, the cattle trust of \$25,000,000, and the Rubber trust, just organized, has a capital of \$35,000,000. "In God we trust" may be a good enough motto for the people of the United States, but its capitalists go in for another "trust" altogether.—[Philadelphia Press.]

An ingenious young beggar has been doing a brisk business along the East river ferries for a few weeks. He is a small, sore-eyed boy ten or twelve years old, with a pinched, sad face. He always has four pennies and wants one more to pay his car fare to Harlem. He worked Wall, South, Fulton and Catharine ferries very successfully until last Saturday. Then a broker at Wall street ferry recognized the little scamp as the same boy to whom he had given a penny early last week on the same plea. The broker denounced him so vigorously that he hasn't been seen there since.—[New York Sun.]

The whole population deals in real estate—it is a veritable fever; all buy; all sell; thus far all make money. As there has been a steady rise and no break eastern capitalists are constantly sending large sums to back up this endless bargaining. The business blocks built and building are very fine, and the people have erected for themselves many beautiful homes. It is a city built in a night, and has therefore every modern improvement and no obsolete inconveniences. And if you did not plunge from a \$50,000 house into a wretched hole filled with almost "squatters sovereignty," you could enjoy its really natural beauty.—[Kansas City Letter.]

A Castle garden conference named Mancini ingratiated himself with two Italian immigrant women the other day, and on pretense of buying their tickets for Chicago, got possession of all their money—some \$800. The money was recovered by the police, and the swindler lodged in jail.

Jay Gould's new private car has been completed at a cost of \$35,000. It was built at Pullman, Ill., and is called the Atlanta.—[Altoona Independent.]

A cent bed house has been established in the City of Mexico, where the poor can find lodgings for that price.—[Echo.]

The Eastern Seaboard bituminous association at a meeting held in Philadelphia, resolved to enforce the rules of the association against the cutting of prices in New York. The association also contemplates making another advance of ten cents a ton in prices about July 1.

On the dusty grass at lunch time I noticed that Mr. Grace's guests were industriously throwing fragments of their feast from the coach, and that yet not a particle of food was to be seen on the grass. Not less than twenty hungry women were hanging about the coach and eagerly picking up the crumbs, even the smallest and least attractive fragments of food. Chicken bones, scraps of bread and pie crust were eagerly snatched up and fought over. From a coach near by a party of young men, gayly inclined, were entertaining a crowd of just such starving wretches, tossing bones to them, and deriving considerable sport from their doglike struggles.—[London letter in New York Sun.]

A white baby was born in South Sioux City, Neb., the other day, and is being the first occurrence of the sort there. The citizens celebrated by serenading the new comer and presenting it with a corner lot.

Bribery is to be made more difficult and costly in Chicago. Under the new law the city will have forty-eight aldermen instead of thirty-six.

It is reported that the Rev. Dr. Reid, a missionary to central Africa, has been eaten by the natives.

Whom the Gods Wish to Destroy.

DENVER, Col., June 6.—Herbert Spencer, in his essay entitled "The Sins of Legislators," tells us that the law passed by the British parliament to relieve the overcrowding of the poor in the east end of London had just the contrary effect to that desired; and that, as a result of the passage of the law, "41,000 artisans were made homeless, and had to find corners for themselves in miserable places that were already overflowing," and further, that "at a cost of six and a quarter millions of dollars to the rate payers, 24,000 persons were unhoused, and houses were provided for 12,000, leaving 9,000 homeless." Let these facts cool the ardor of those who expect much good from the millions of dollars to be expended in improving the condition of the tenement house population of New York City. To those who may be able to pay the increased rent demanded for those tenements near the improvements some benefits may accrue, but the abjectly poor, it is manifest, will derive none whatever.

What will most surprise those who are engineering these imaginary philanthropies, is the fact that Herbert Spencer sees and deplores in them a practical step toward that socialism which is the opprobrium, the terror and the raw head and bloody bones of the capitalist press, churches and classes. Has that madness seized them which it is said the gods visit on those they intend to destroy?

C. S. E.

The Anti-Poverty Democratic Party.

PORT JERVIS, N. Y., June 8.—The name of the new party will be settled in this way: The "old liners" will hereafter coalesce, and this aggregation will be known as the republican party. When the conservatives have "got together, what then remains for the radical, go-ahead people—the men and women who move the world? They must in time unite on some great principles. Those principles, I think, will be universal suffrage and "the land for all the people." These forces are moving rapidly. The democratic party sees the handwriting on the wall. The present democratic party must do something. It must absorb the new forces, or else be absorbed. There is no alternative. And the new forces will be known as the democratic party. It is a good name, although somewhat hackneyed and sadly and shamefully misused. But the economic forces will renovate it and wash it white as snow. It will be once more the democratic party of Jefferson.

W. T. DORR.

They Came to Scold, But Went Away Bemoaning.

GREEN ISLAND, N. Y., June 7.—Dr. McGlynn's lecture in Troy has made him a host of friends. Men came to hear him and to condemn him. With surly faces they watched him as he made his appearance on the stage, and sneered at the grand round of applause that greeted him as he stepped forward. But in a few minutes a pleased expression came over their faces, and before the lecture was half over they were lost in their applauding. Father McGlynn has set many men to thinking and has helped our cause a great deal. At the close of the lecture many addresses of many who wished to join our organization were handed in, among them two clergymen, one a Catholic priest and the other a Protestant.

HENRY C. ROMAN.

pany and peddled all over the state
same price—distance making no dif-
We can show him where salt from gr-
works is sold in the same manner.
show him how unpatedented dealers ge-
inducements, and how outrageous fre-
charged on unpatedented railroads. We
show him "unpatedented American
tries which are monopolies," the
son of the aggressions of
corporations, until his eyes would
and he would gasp for breath. Cor-
young man, and grow up with the co-
and while growing up learn the ways
world as they are here presented.—
Bee.

